DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 473 FL 015 102

TITLE	A Study of the Extent and Effect of English Language Training for Refugees. Phase One: Results of a Comprehensive Mail Survey.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg. Office of Research and Evaluation Services.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Refugee Resettlement (DHHS), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 82
CONTRACT	HHS-100-81-0066
NOTE	181p.; For related documents, see FL 015 101-105.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Costs; Educational Quality; *English (Second Language); *Financial Support; National Surveys; Policy Formation; Program Administration; Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; Public Policy; *Refugees; Regional Planning; *Second Language Instruction; State Agencies; *Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

Results of a national mail survey of regional, state, and local agencies administering English language training programs for refugees, the first phase of a larger study of the training programs, are reported. An introductory section outlines the survey and procedure. The responses and statistical analyses are summarized, and some data tables are provided. The responses came from 8 regional, 36 state, and 232 local agencies and concerned four topics: (1) the nature and extent of English language training for refugees, including the characteristics of local service providers and their programs; (2) the resources and costs involved in that training, including the sources of funds and the ways they are allocated; (3) the characteristics of the refugees receiving training; (4) factors relating to program quality and success. Recommendations based on the findings are made to four groups: local service providers, state level refugee program administrators, national policymakers, and orgnizations engaged in research and evaluation. Appended materials include the three questionnaires sent to local, regional, and state administrators and coordinators; normative tables of key English language training program characteristics; further notes on the survey methodology; and tables comparing the results from the 15 states with the largest refugee populations to results for all programs.(MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258473

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Study of the Extent and Effect of English Language Training for Refugees

Phase One: Results of A Comprehensive Mail Survey

September 1982

Prepared for:

Office of Refugee Resettlement
United States Department of Health and Human Services

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Margaret Rogers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

[X] This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

by

Literacy & Language Program
Division of Evaluation, Research and Assessment
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

FL 015 102

The material presented herein was developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory under Contract Number HHS-100-81-0066 with the United States Department of Health and Human Services. The opinions expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Health and Human Services and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

PREFACE

In FY 1981, the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement awarded a contract to the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory to study the extent and effect of English language training for refugees. The study is comprised of three phases: (1) a mail survey of English language training programs, (2) an on-site review of a sample of programs and (3) the measurement of adult refugees' acquisition of English as it relates to various mixes of language training and employment.

This report presents the results of the first phase of the study, a comprehensive mail survey concerning the provision of English language training for refugees. Three questionnaires were used, each targeted to a different level of the service delivery system: one for the ten regional offices of the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement, one for the 52 state-level agencies which administer the refugee resettlement program and one for the 327 local service providers which directly deliver refugee English language training using ORR funds. The survey was conducted in the Spring of 1982 and focuses upon the extent, nature, quality and cost of English language training during federal fiscal years 1981 and 1982.

The report consists of four parts. The first section presents an overview of the survey's rationale and purpose. The second section provides a brief summary of the survey methodology and response rate. Detailed survey procedures are described in Appendix E. The third section presents and discusses the survey findings and the final section offers interpretations and recommendations. An executive summary has been produced under separate cover.

The report reflects the culmination of an enormous cooperative effort on the part of individuals and agencies at the local, state and federal levels. We would like to thank the advisory consultants who assisted with the development of the questionnaires: Joyce Wilson, Jim Pullen, Jerry Burns, Thomas Gilligan and Tom Dieterich. The dedicated assistance of NWREL staff Mary Cohn, Bill Hadley, Susan Barfield and Charline Nemeth is also noteworthy. The collaboration and assistance of each and every one of these individuals is sincerely appreciated.

Stephen Reder
Steven Nelson
Judy Arter

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface	iii
I.	Overview of the Survey	1
	A. Background	1
	B. Purpose	2
II.	Survey Procedures and Response Data	7
III.	Study Findings	13
	A. Nature and Extent of English Language Training for Refugees	15
	B. The Resources and Costs Involved in English Language Training for Refugees	34
	C. Characteristics of Refugees Engaged in English Language Training	41
	D. Factors Relating to Program Quality and Success	54
IV.	Conclusions and Recommendations	81
	A. Local Service Providers of Refugee English Language Training	81
	B. State Agencies Which Administer and Coordinate Refugee English Language Training	85
	C. National Policy-makers Who Deal with Refugee Resettlement	86
	D. Organizations Engaged in Continuing Research and Evaluation Efforts	89

Page

APPENDICES

A	Local Service Providers' Questionnaire	91
B	State Coordinators' Questionnaire	93
C	ORR Regional Office Questionnaire	95
D	Normative Tables of Key English Language Training Program Characteristics	97
E	Survey Methodology	107
	A. Specific Procedures	107
	B. Instrumentation	110
F	Tables Comparing Results for the 15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations to Results for All Programs	111

INDEX OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Response Rates of Survey Recipients	8
2	Survey Response Rates of Local Service Providers, by State	10
3	Summary of Local Service Providers, by Organizational Type	18
4	Primary Functions of Local Service Provider Organizations	19
5	Percentage of English Language Training Programs Providing Various Adult Refugee Services in FY 82	21
6	Percentage of States Giving Heavy Emphasis to Various Refugee English Language Training Services	23
7	Local Service Providers' Emphases on Various Instructional Goals	23
8	Local Service Providers' Use of Various Student Characteristics in Planning Instruction	25
9	State Priorities for Refugees' Admission into English Language Training	26
10	Local Service Providers' Criteria for Refugees' Admissions into English Language Training	27
11	Use of Paid English Language Training Program Staff in Various Positions	28
12	Local Service Providers' Use of Bilingual Personnel	29
13	Local Service Providers' Training and Experience Requirements for Full-Time Teachers	30
14	Local Service Providers' Training and Experience Requirements for Part-Time Teachers	31
15	Median Percentage of Funds from Various Sources Administered by States for Refugee English Language Training, by Year	35
16	Percentage of Local Programs Using Various Non-ORR Funds for Refugee English Language Training, by Year	36
17	Median Percentage and Amount of Funds Received from ORR for Refugee English Language Training Programs	37

Table		Page
18	Mean Percentage of Funds for Refugee English Language Training Expended for Various Purposes, by Year	39
19	Median Cost Per Student Instructional Hour for Refugee English Language Training, by Year	40
20	Percentage of Refugees Enrolled in English Language Training Programs, by Size and Year	43
21	Sex of Adult Refugee Students, by Year	44
22	Age Distribution of Refugee Students, by Year	45
23	Ethnic Distribution of Adult Refugee Students, by Year . . .	46
24	Distribution of Adult Refugee Students' Formal Education in Country of Origin, by Year	47
25	Literacy of Adult Refugee Students, by Year	48
26	Adult Refugee Students' Length of Residence in the United States, by Year	49
27	Employment Status of Adult Refugee Students, by Year	50
28	Percentage of State Coordinators and Local Programs Indicating the Existence and Feasibility of Program Standards	58
29	Program Information Currently Collected by States	59
30	Information Maintained by Local Service Providers in Refugee Student Records	61
31	Median Number of Instructional Hours Required for Prototypic Refugee Adults to Achieve Three Levels of English Proficiency	65
32	Median Cost per Student to Achieve Various Levels of English Language Proficiency	68
33	Reasons for Student Departures	69
34	Rank Order of Technical Assistance Needs	73
35	Rank Order of Sources of Assistance Sought by Local Service Providers	73
36	Requests Received by State Coordinators for Technical Assistance from Local Service Providers	74

Table

		Page
37	Sources of Staff Development Training Used by Local Service Providers	76
38	Degree of Coordination Perceived and Required Between English Language Training and Other Services	77
39	Local Service Providers' Perceptions of Coordination Linkages Between Their English Language Training Program and Other Services and Agencies	78

APPENDIX D NORMATIVE TABLES OF KEY ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

D-1	Normative distribution of the number of locations at which organizations provide refugee English language training (LA1)	99
D-2	Normative distribution of the percentage of local service providers' clientele who are refugees in FY 82 (LA4)	100
D-3	Normative distribution of the cost per refugee student instructional hour in FY 82 (LB2)	101
D-4	Normative distribution of the number of full-time teachers employed in English language training programs (LD1) . . .	102
D-5	Normative distribution of the number of part-time teachers employed in English language training programs (LD1) . . .	102
D-6	Normative distribution of the number of course levels offered concurrently by local service providers (LE2) . . .	103
D-7	Normative distribution of the average number of hours per day a class is offered by local service providers (LE2)	104
D-8	Normative distribution of the average weeks per term classes are offered by local service providers (LE2) . . .	104
D-9	Normative distribution of the number of students per teacher in English language training classes (LE2)	105
D-10	Normative distribution of the percentage of English language training paid teachers who are full-time (LD1) . .	105
D-11	Normative distribution of the percentage of English language training program funds directly devoted to instructional costs (LB1)	106

Page

APPENDIX F TABLES COMPARING RESULTS FOR THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST REFUGEE POPULATIONS TO RESULTS FOR ALL PROGRAMS

F-1 Local Service Providers' Criteria for Refugees' Admission into English Language Training 112

F-2 Local Service Providers' Training and Experience Requirements for Full-Time Teachers 113

F-3 Local Service Providers' Training and Experience Requirements for Part-Time Teachers 113

F-4 Median Percentage and Amounts of Funds Received from ORR by Refugee English Language Training Programs 114

F-5 Median Cost Per Student Instructional Hour for Refugee English Language Training, by Year 114

F-6 Sex of Adult Refugee Students by Year for the 15 States With the Largest Refugee Population and the Nation as a Whole 114

F-7 Age Distribution of Adult Refugee Students for Programs in the 15 States With the Largest Refugee Populations and for the Nation As a Whole 115

F-8 Distribution of Adult Refugee Students' Formal Education in Country of Origin for the 15 States With the Largest Populations and for the Nation As a Whole 116

F-9 Distribution of Adult Refugee Students' Formal Education in Country of Origin, by Year 117

F-10 Literacy of Adult Refugee Students in FY 81 and FY 82 for Programs in the 15 States With the Largest Refugee Populations and for the Nation As a Whole 117

F-11 Adult Refugee Students' Length of Residence in the United States for Programs in the 15 States With the Largest Refugee Populations and All Programs in the Nation, by Year 118

F-12 Employment Status of Adult Refugee Students, by Year . . . 118

A Study of the Extent and Effect of English Language Training for Refugees

Phase I: Comprehensive Mail Survey

I

Overview of the Survey

A. Background

The U. S. Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) provides funding to the states to provide a broad range of social services intended to help refugees achieve self-sufficiency as quickly as possible. In addition to English language training, a variety of other services are provided under the refugee resettlement program, including career counseling, vocational training, translation services, child care and job development. Services are provided by states both through purchase-of-service contracts with local contractors and by public social service agencies.

The rapid achievement of economic self-sufficiency has been established as the primary goal of refugee resettlement by the Refugee Act of 1980. Both employment services and English language training are considered vital in promoting refugee self-sufficiency. The lack of English proficiency, in particular, is often identified as the major barrier to self-sufficiency. Service Delivery Assessments conducted by the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services question whether these services are effectively promoting the goal of self-sufficiency.

As part of the Office of Refugee Resettlement's effort to gather information about the effectiveness of these services and the process of refugee resettlement, contracts were awarded in FY 81 for studies of

refugee attainment of self-sufficiency, the effectiveness of English language training for refugees, implementation of the matching grant approach to resettlement assistance and the state coordinators' administration of the refugee program.

The present study is ORR's first attempt to obtain a comprehensive picture of the English language training activities supported under the refugee resettlement program. The need for the study derives both from ORR's role in funding English language training--by far the largest source of funds for English language programs--and from the crucial role of English language training in the resettlement program. It has been widely felt that learning English is the sine qua non of effective resettlement. ORR's obligation is both to understand the extent, nature and effect of the English language training activities and to help improve the quality of the English language training provided under the refugee resettlement program. Section 412(a) of the Refugee Act of 1980 requires that the Office of Refugee Resettlement conduct evaluations of the effectiveness of the programs it funds (7(A)) and collect data on the services provided and the results achieved (7(C)).

B. Purpose

The Study of the Extent and Effect of English Language Training for Refugees is designed to characterize the extent, nature, quality and cost of English language training being provided to refugees through the refugee resettlement program. The study will also attempt to ascertain the most effective approaches to English language training, particularly for Southeast Asian refugees with little prior exposure to English, Western culture or classroom instruction.

The study consists of three phases. The first phase is a comprehensive mail survey of ORR-funded service providers. The second and third phases provide a more detailed look at a sample of English language training programs and the measurement of refugee language acquisition.

This report concerns only the first phase of the study, the comprehensive mail survey. The purpose of the first phase is to collect information concerning the English language training programs funded by ORR for refugee adults. A mail survey of three respondent groups was conducted to gather descriptive and qualitative information regarding (1) the extent, nature and cost of ORR-funded English language training programs across the nation and (2) successful models and program designs for English language training.

The specific questions addressed by the survey are outlined below:

Topic	Study Question
Nature and Extent of English Language Training for Refugees	1. What is the nature and background of English language training service providers?
	2. What are the major functions which local service providers perform?
	3. What services are available to adult refugees from these programs?
	4. Are priorities established for English language instruction?
	5. Is English language training tailored to refugees?
	6. Is student entry into English language training programs prioritized?

7. How are English language training programs staffed?

8. How large are the ORR-funded refugee English language training programs?

9. What is the intensity of English language instruction for refugee adults?

10. What major factors tend to differentiate refugee English language training programs?

The Resources and Costs Involved in English Language Training for Refugees

1. What sources of funds are devoted to English language training for refugees?

2. How are resources allocated from the state level to the local level?

3. How are funds used by English language training programs?

The Characteristics of Refugees Engaged in English Language Training

1. How many refugees are receiving English language training?

2. What are the characteristics of the refugee students?

3. What factors influence refugee participation in English language training?

Factors Relating to Program Quality and Success

1. What evidence is available concerning program performance?

2. To what extent have English language training programs demonstrated their effectiveness?

3. What program characteristics are perceived to be related to program performance?

4. What program improvement efforts have been implemented?

II

SURVEY PROCEDURES AND RESPONSE DATA

The purpose of the mail survey is to collect a range of programmatic and cost information on the English language training programs which receive ORR funds in order to determine their extent, cost, quality and effects. Since the study is concerned with the extent of services in the nation, a census rather than sample approach was used. The survey addressed three respondent groups, representing the three levels of refugee program administration--(1) the ten Regional offices of ORR, (2) the 52 state coordinator offices which administer ORR funds and services including Guam and the District of Columbia, and (3) the 327 service providers which directly provide English language training to adult refugees.*

Questionnaires were designed for each of the three respondent groups. The questionnaires included items unique to each group, as well as a number of common elements for comparative purposes. The most detailed programmatic information was requested from the local service providers, whereas more general administrative information was requested in the state and regional questionnaires. The local service provider, state coordinator and ORR regional office questionnaires are presented in Appendix A, B and C, respectively.

---

*This number is an approximation, based upon information available for English language training programs which were ORR-funded in FY 1981 and/or FY 1982.

The mail survey provided information about English language training programs for refugees in 43 states. Questionnaires were returned by eight regional offices, 35 state coordinators and 232 local service providers. The response rates for the various groups are presented below in Table 1.

Table 1

RESPONSE RATES OF SURVEY RECIPIENTS

Group	N	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Regional offices	10	8	80%
State coordinators	52	36	69%
Local service providers	327	232	71%
Total	389	276	71%

The proportion of local service providers returning the survey questionnaire varies from state to state. Response rates varied from zero percent to 100 percent. Table 2 provides a summary of the number of local service providers in each state, and the survey response rate for each state. Six states and territories had local service provider return rates of less than 50 percent. When the refugee populations for these areas were totalled, the total population represents less than six percent of the national refugee population. On the other hand, the overall return rate for the fifteen states having the largest refugee populations--containing roughly 80 percent of the national refugee population--was 70%, reflecting a relatively substantial representation for these sites. Thus, the survey is considered to be quite representative of refugee English language training programs, since the response rate was substantial for those areas having large concentrations of refugees.

A follow-up was conducted of agencies not responding to the survey questionnaires. The primary reasons for not returning the surveys included (1) the amount of time required to complete the survey and limitations of staff to compile the information required, (2) knowledgeable staff members who could respond to the survey were no longer employed by the agency, and (3) the survey was lost in the mail. In a few instances, negative reactions to the study were encountered because of the policy and funding issues taking effect at the time of the survey. However, in the vast majority of the cases, the study was well received by the respondents and non-response bias did not appear to have a major influence on the results.

The thirty-six questionnaires returned by state coordinators represent areas having slightly more than half of the refugee population in the nation. However, returns were <u>not</u> received from two states which have very large refugee populations, together containing nearly one-third of the national refugee population. Therefore, the state coordinators' survey results do not necessarily represent states with the largest refugee populations. Although the survey attempted a complete census of all agencies dealing with refugee English language training, the exclusion of non-respondents and non-ORR-funded providers limits presentation of results to national and state-wide averages, rather than totals.

Table 2

SURVEY RESPONSE RATES OF LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS, BY STATE

State	Number of Cases Returned	Total Number of Providers	Return Rate
Alabama	6	6	100%
Alaska	0	0	--
Arizona	2	2	100%
Arkansas	5	6	83%
California	25	35	71%
Colorado	4	5	80%
Connecticut	2	2	100%
Delaware	0	0	--
District of Columbia	2	3	67%
Florida	6	11	55%
Georgia	1	2	50%
Guam	0	1	0%
Hawaii	0	2	0%
Idaho	3	4	75%
Illinois	16	21	76%
Indiana	0	1	0%
Iowa	0	2	0%
Kansas	3	5	60%
Kentucky	3	3	100%
Louisiana	3	4	75%
Maine	1	2	50%
Maryland	5	7	71%
Massachusetts	9	10	90%
Michigan	7	7	100%
Minnesota	17	28	61%
Mississippi	1	1	100%
Missouri	2	3	67%
Montana	2	2	100%
Nebraska	5	7	71%
Nevada	1	1	100%
New Hampshire	1	1	100%
New Jersey	5	6	83%
New Mexico	1	1	100%
New York	7	13	54%
North Carolina	2	2	100%
North Dakota	8	12	67%
Ohio	6	8	75%
Oklahoma	3	3	100%
Oregon	9	11	82%
Pennsylvania	8	10	80%
Puerto Rico	0	0	--
Rhode Island	2	4	50%
South Carolina	6	7	86%
South Dakota	0	1	0%

Table 2
Continued

State	Number of Cases Returned	Total Number of Providers	Return Rate
Tennessee	3	5	60%
Texas	5	9	56%
Utah	14	19	74%
Vermont	1	1	100%
Virginia	2	4	50%
Washington	17	24	71%
West Virginia	0	0	--
Wisconsin	0	2	0%
Wyoming	1	1	100%
TOTAL	232	327	71%

III

Study Findings

In the text of this report, the term "refugee" refers to those individuals included in the Refugee Act of 1980 as well as Haitian and Cuban entrants. English language training refers to those services and programs which emphasize the instruction of the English language, vocational or prevocational English training, as well as those guidance and support services which are an integral part of such instruction. The survey focuses upon those English language training programs and services which were at least partially supported by funds appropriated to the U. S. Office of Refugee Resettlement for refugee social services during either federal fiscal year 1981 or 1982.

The survey results are primarily based upon the responses of the 232 local service providers completing the survey questionnaire. These results have been augmented where appropriate by the information collected in the state and regional surveys.

The findings are presented in four major sections:

A. Nature and Extent of English Language Training for Refugees, which describes the characteristics of the local service providers and their programs.

B. Resources and Costs Involved in English Language Training for Refugees, which explores the sources of dollars and manner in which funds are devoted to refugee English language training.

C. Characteristics of Refugees Engaged in English Language Training, which describes the number and background of refugees enrolled in English language training programs.

D. Factors Relating to Program Quality and Success, which explores a variety of information on program performance and outcomes.

Each of the four sections is organized into two parts. Each section begins with a synopsis of the major study findings relating to the topic. The second part of each section considers the specific findings in terms of the related study questions. To facilitate inspection of questionnaire wording, the reader is directed to specific items by codes within the body of the text. The letters R, S and L, designating the regional, state and local surveys are followed by additional codes for the section, item number and subcategory within the questionnaires. For example, (LC3a) refers to item 3a within Section C of the local survey questionnaire. Where tables are presented, the "N" count reflects the number of valid responses to the survey item. The response rate will vary from item to item.

Conclusions and recommendations drawn from the survey findings may be found in Chapter IV.

A. The Nature and Extent of English Language Training for Refugees

About one-half of the ORR-funded English language training programs for refugees are based in secondary school adult education programs and community colleges. The remaining programs are housed within a wide range of public and private nonprofit organizations. About two-thirds of the agencies are educational institutions, while the other one-third could be characterized as multi-service community organizations. About three-fifths of all local service providers are from the public sector.

Most of the organizations are multi-purpose in their mission, largely engaged in human resource development. Two-thirds of these organizations historically provided English language training prior to ORR funding. Nearly all feel that they continue to serve their original clientele successfully and that ORR funding has enhanced the overall quality of their programs. Most programs provide a range of support services to adult refugees beyond English language training. The pattern of services has remained stable except in the area of transportation and translation/interpretation, which have declined somewhat. Currently most (60%) local service providers' primary clientele are refugees, which accounts for the wide range of resettlement/support services provided to refugees by these programs.

State coordinators who administer the English language training programs direct funds primarily for survival English training. Priority is also given by the states to meeting employment-related goals for adult refugee training, but at the local level program goals tend to stress literacy and cultural orientation. Survival English and employment goals are shared by both state coordinators and local service providers.

Considering the goals and services, local service providers tend to view English language training broadly, as an enculturation process, whereas state coordinators view such instruction more narrowly, as training which leads directly to employment.

More than two-thirds of the programs do not tailor their English language training to a specific kind of adult refugee, such as those who are non-literate. Where differentiation does occur, the refugee student's level of English, previous literacy, and academic and employment status are the most important factors.

Admissions priorities for refugee training are in effect in a majority of the states, primarily in the 15 states with the greatest population of refugees. Recency of arrival and eligibility for public assistance are the most commonly used admission criteria. Nearly all states impose time limits on refugee participation in English language training--an average of about 13.5 months. At the local level, similar priorities are also imposed by those programs, again primarily in the 15 most impacted states.

English language training programs are most often staffed by part-time personnel. Part-time teachers make up the largest segment (40%) of all paid positions in the programs. Volunteers are also used in about one-half of the programs. Student-teacher ratios average 15:1. Bilingual personnel work in more than three-fourths of the programs, usually as aides and counselors. Despite the extensive use of bilingual staff, a low priority is given to bilingual instruction by most programs.

About one-half of the programs have educational and experiential qualifications for their instructional staff. Where differences exist between requirements for full time and part-time staff, qualifications for

part-time teachers generally equal or exceed those for full-time teachers. English language teachers are generally expected to hold a baccalaureate degree and teaching certificate and have one year of relevant experience.

Programs provide English language training at one to three locations, enrolling an average of 177 refugees during FY 1982, down somewhat from the previous year. During March 1982, programs generally offered six parallel sections each of four instructional levels.

Classes usually run three hours per day, four days per week over a 15-week term, comprising about 160 hours of instruction per course. Most courses enroll refugee adults exclusively. English language training programs had an average refugee enrollment of 87 adults in March 1982.

A factor analysis of reported characteristics of English language training programs for refugees identified four major dimensions which differentiate programs--program size, emphasis upon employment, degree of service coordination and linkage, and emphasis upon vocational English as a second language.

1. What is the nature and background of English language training service providers?

Local service providers were asked (LA2) to identify the nature of their organization. Table 3 provides a summary of local service providers' organizational type. Most agencies are high school adult education and community college institutions. These two organizational types encompass nearly half of all agencies.

Table 3

SUMMARY OF LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS, BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE
(n = 231)

Type of Organization	Percent of Respondents
Secondary school adult education programs	26.1
Community colleges	23.0
Voluntary agencies and resettlement agencies	14.6
Other nonprofit agencies	13.7
Vocational-technical schools	10.6
Universities and colleges	3.5
Other type of agency	8.5

A wide variety of agencies make up the remaining half of the local service providers. They include volags and resettlement agencies, mutual assistance associations (MAAs), churches, CETA prime sponsors, vocational-technical schools, city, county and state public agencies, four-year institutions of higher education, and private nonprofit service groups.

Basically, the organizations which provide English language training for refugees fall into two categories: educational institutions, (such as public schools, community colleges, universities and vocational-technical schools, which make up about two-thirds of the organizations), and multi-service agencies, (such as resettlement agencies, community service organizations, churches, mutual assistance agencies and public agencies).

Another way of looking at the organizational configuration of the local service providers is to compare the proportion of agencies in the public and private sectors. About three-fifths of the agencies are public, whereas two-fifths are private. Most of the organizations from the private sector are nonprofit. Thus, a substantial segment of refugee English language training is being done in the private sector.

State coordinators were asked to identify which organizations are eligible to apply for ORR money to provide refugee English language training (SC3). Nearly all (85%) of the responding states permit private nonprofit agencies to apply, 79% permit public institutions to apply, and 64.7% accept applications from other state agencies. Less than one-third (29%) of the responding states utilize either sole-source procurement procedures or profit-making organizations for English language training. A combination of requests for proposals or bids (SC4) are used by more than three-fourths (76%) of the states for procurement of services. Unsolicited proposals and subcontractors are used by the remaining respondents.

2. What are the major functions which local service providers perform?

Local programs were asked to identify the primary services which they provide (LA3). Most of the 232 respondents indicated that their agencies perform several primary functions. Table 4 lists the primary functions identified by the local service providers receiving ORR funds. Local service provider respondents were also asked if their institutions had historically been involved in English language training prior to refugee-targeted funding (LC5). Fully

Table 4

PRIMARY FUNCTIONS OF LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDER ORGANIZATIONS
(n = 232)

Function	Percent of Respondents*
Language training	89.2
Counseling	71.6
Cultural orientation	69.0
Job placement services	58.2
Adult basic education	56.5
Vocational training	50.0
Testing and placement services	49.1
Academic preparation	47.8
Resettlement services	26.7

*Respondents could name more than one response category

two-thirds (68.1%) of the 232 respondents indicated that English language training had been provided by their organization in the past. Of the local service providers who had not provided English language training in the past, 74 percent now serve refugees almost exclusively. Forty two percent of the programs which had been operated in the past now serve refugees exclusively. Programs which have come into operation since the onset of ORR funding are significantly more likely to serve refugees as their primary clientele. Furthermore, essentially all (97.4) of the respondents indicated that they have continued to serve their original clientele population after the onset of refugee language training funds. Most (87.1%) also feel that the initiation of funding targeted for refugee language training has enhanced the overall quality of their English language training program. Thus, most organizations have had prior experience in language training, have continued their primary mission and feel that refugee training funds benefit their programs as a whole.

3. What services are available to adult refugees from these programs?

Respondents identified all services provided to adult refugees (not just the primary ones noted above) in another item (LA6). Three major analyses of their responses were conducted. First, service mix was compared for local service providers over a two-year period--FY 81 and FY 82--to determine if refugee services are changing. The responses of 214 English language training programs which operated in both years were compared. Only two forms of service varied. A slight decline in the number of programs providing transportation (6%) and translation services (7%) was noted. Thus, by and large, the mix of service available to refugees has been relatively stable.

The second analysis examines the major kinds of services currently available to refugees. Table 5 outlines the percentage of programs which provide the various services to adult refugees.

Table 5

PERCENTAGE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS PROVIDING VARIOUS ADULT REFUGEE SERVICES IN FY 82
(n = 224)

Service	Percent of Respondents
English as a second language	96.0*
Orientation	75.0
Intake and assessment	72.8
Career counseling	68.3
Prevocational training	63.4
Translation/interpretation	62.9
Job placement	59.8
Social adjustment	58.5
Outreach/referral	58.0
Health care provision or referral	54.9
Vocational training	45.1
Transportation	40.2
Home management	37.9
Housing referral	34.8
Child care	24.6
Mental health counseling	24.1
Sponsor training	21.4
Legal assistance	13.8
Other services	25.4

More than half of the local programs provide a range of direct services to adult refugees: The average number of services named per program is 9.7. Most programs provide direct, client-centered services, such as translation, orientation, referral, job placement and prevocational training. Less than half of the programs provide ancillary services, such as child care, sponsor training and home management. One-fourth of the programs noted "other services," primarily refugee advocacy, immigration, resettlement and emergency assistance, and survival skills.

The third analysis of the information examines the relationship between overall institutional function (Table 4) and services provided specifically to refugees (Table 5).

*The percentage of English language training programs providing ESL is not 100 percent, since English language training may be provided only as an adjunct to other services listed in the Table.

The range and mix of services does not vary significantly with institutional functions. The probable reason for this lack of variation is that the local agencies currently serve refugees as their major client population. When local service providers identified the percentage of their clientele which is refugee (LA4), 213 respondents indicated that refugees were the exclusive clientele for 42% of the programs. The remaining 58% of the programs do not serve refugees exclusively--refugees constitute an average of 35% of the clientele for these programs. This distribution of clientele did not change from FY 81 to FY 82.

4. Are priorities established for English language instruction?

State coordinators' responses to two items indicate that priorities were established for English language training. First, state coordinators were asked how funds are targeted to specific kinds of English language training for refugees (SC2). Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that funds are directed toward specific types of language training. The most commonly targeted type of training is survival English, which also tends to receive the greatest proportion of funds. Vocational English is the second most frequently targeted training followed by specific employment-related English. Orientation training is also targeted by a small number of states.

A second item in the state questionnaire focuses on the relative emphasis given to various language and employment services for refugees (SC8). Of the 35 state agencies responding to this item, 83% indicated that their state specifies priorities for refugee English language training goals. The relative emphasis given by states to various service priorities is summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

PERCENTAGE OF STATES GIVING HEAVY EMPHASIS TO VARIOUS REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING SERVICES

Service Goal	N	Percent of States Giving Heavy Emphasis
Employment	29	93.1
Survival English	30	83.3
Job services	28	60.7
Job-specific English	27	29.6
Vocational English	25	28.0
Cultural orientation	28	21.4
Bilingual orientation	27	11.1
Literacy training	28	3.6

Employment and functional English were reported to be heavily emphasized by most states. As a point of interest, no states responding give heavy emphasis to the reading and writing of English. States gave high priority to those services believed to be most closely associated with refugee self-sufficiency--employment and oral language.

Local English language training programs were asked a parallel question about the relative emphasis given to these various instructional goals (LE1). Table 7 provides a summary of program priorities for English language instruction.

Table 7

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' EMPHASES ON VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS

Instructional Goal	N	Percent of Local Service Providers Giving Heavy Emphasis
Survival English	223	91.0
Employment	217	52.1
Cultural orientation	218	45.0
Reading/writing English	223	40.4
Literacy Training	217	40.1
Job services	207	37.7
Vocational English	220	37.3
Job-specific English	218	24.3
Bilingual orientation	205	12.7

The instructional priorities of the state coordinators and their local service providers apparently differ. Although survival English and employment are emphasized by both, the state coordinators give more emphasis to job services, job-specific English and vocational English, whereas local programs place more emphasis on basic literacy training, reading and writing English, and cultural orientation. This difference suggests that the path to refugee self-sufficiency is viewed quite differently at the state and local levels. Local agencies tend to view language instruction as a broad process of enculturation rather than as a narrow training program leading directly to employment.

5. Is English language training tailored to the specific needs of refugees?

Local service providers were asked to indicate if their English language training programs are particularly well-suited to a specific segment of the refugee population (LC6). Two-thirds (68.9%) of the 225 respondents indicated that to the contrary, their programs were designed for the general adult refugee population. The remaining one-third of the programs are directed toward refugees of a specific ethnicity, literacy level or language ability level.

Local programs were also asked to rate the importance of various refugee student characteristics in differentiating instruction (LC4). Table 8 lists those factors rated by local programs as being very important in differentiating English language instruction for individual refugees.

Table 8

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' USE OF VARIOUS STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS IN PLANNING INSTRUCTION

Student Characteristics	N	Percent of Programs Rating as Very Important
Present level of English	222	83.8
Literacy	227	67.0
Academic/vocational level	219	33.3
Employment status	221	20.4
Age	223	5.8
Ethnicity	220	2.7
Sex	222	0.9

The most important factors considered by local service providers focus on the educational background of the learner--level of English, literacy and academic level. Age, ethnicity and sex are considered to be secondary factors (which are strongly related to educational background among refugees). Apparently, most local service providers attempt to differentiate their courses according to refugee student characteristics, even though their programs as a whole are designed to serve the entire adult refugee population.

6. Is student entry into English language training programs prioritized?

State coordinators were asked to identify elements of state policy which establish admissions priorities governing refugees' entry into English language training programs (SB1). Nearly two-thirds (61.1%) of the 36 coordinators responding indicated that state policies prioritize refugee admissions into English language training programs. Table 9 summarizes the most common state priorities for student admissions.

Table 9

STATE PRIORITIES FOR REFUGEES' ADMISSION INTO ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

Criteria	Percent of States
New arrivals	81.8
Eligibility for public assistance	59.1
Employment status*	45.5
Head of household/primary wage earner	40.9
Other	45.5

Recency of arrival and eligibility for public assistance are the most common admissions criteria. Nearly half of the respondents mentioned other criteria. Two of these additional criteria are in common use--level of English proficiency and receipt of public assistance. Among the 15 states having the most refugees,** 10 of 13 respondents (77%) have admissions priorities. Thus, a somewhat greater proportion of states with the largest refugee populations use admissions priorities.

State coordinators were also asked if they limit the amount of English language training which a refugee may receive under refugee resettlement support (SB2). Of the 15 state coordinators responding to this item, nearly all (86.7%) indicated that time limits are set. The limit ranges from 6 to 36 months among the states, with a median of 13.5 months. It is not known if local service providers rigidly conform to these limits.

---

*Unemployed/underemployed

**As of May 31, 1982, ORR identified these states as California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin. Results for these 15 states were tabulated separately and compared to results to the nation as a whole for a number of other variables. In most cases, the results did not differ. However, these results are presented in Appendix F.

Local English language training programs were asked a parallel question (LC3) about priorities for refugees' admissions into their programs. Of the 223 programs responding, 44.4% indicated that refugee student eligibility for admissions to English language training programs are prioritized. Of the 110 responding programs in the 15 states with the largest refugee populations, 77.3% use admissions priorities, a substantially greater proportion than programs as a whole.

Table 10 displays programs' use of various admissions criteria.

Table 10

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' CRITERIA FOR REFUGEES' ADMISSION INTO ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING
(n = 223)

Criterion	Percent of Programs*
New arrivals	74.5
Head of household	65.3
Employment status	60.2
Eligibility for public assistance	57.1

*Percentages do not add to 100 since programs may use several admissions priorities.

7. How are refugee English language training programs staffed?

Local service providers were asked to list the number and nature of current staff positions in their refugee English language training programs (LD1). Table 11 displays the proportion of paid staff in various positions and compensation in status:

Table 11

USE OF PAID ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM STAFF
IN VARIOUS POSITIONS
(n = 210)

Staff Position	Compensation Status		
	Full Time	Part-Time	Total
Administrator	4.8	1.0	5.8
Teacher	16.7	40.0	56.7
Instructional aide	2.4	9.5	11.9
Tutor	0.5	2.8	3.3
Clerical	2.3	4.3	6.6
Special services	6.2	5.7	11.9
Other	1.0	2.8	3.8
Total	33.9	66.1	100

By and large, the greatest percentage of program staff are teachers, occupying well over half of the paid positions (56.7%). Instructional aides and special services staff together hold nearly one-fourth of the positions, with 11.9% each. About two-thirds (66.1%) of all paid positions are part-time, with part-time teachers representing 40% of all staff.

Most teachers (71%) are employed on a part-time basis. Only special services and administrative positions are commonly full time, whereas all other positions are predominately part-time.

Forty-six percent of the local service providers also noted the use of volunteers in their programs. When paid and volunteer positions are considered together, 39% of all program staff are volunteers. Further, these volunteer positions are predominately instructional in nature. Sixty-two percent (62%) of the volunteers serve as tutors, 18.6% as teachers and 8.6% as aides.

The median student-teacher ratio (LE2) reported by the local service providers is 15:1. Reported ratios ranged from 1:1 to 41:1, but typically are in the range of one

teacher for every 12 to 20 students. The normative distribution of the student-teacher ratio for reporting programs (n = 180) is listed in Appendix D, Program Norms.

Another characteristic of program staffing is the use of bilingual personnel (LD2). Seventy-eight percent of the local service providers responding (n = 232) use bilingual personnel in one or more capacities. Table 12 lists the percentage of programs using various bilingual personnel.

Table 12

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' USE OF BILINGUAL PERSONNEL
(n = 232)

Category of Bilingual Personnel	Percent of Programs
Aides	42
Counselors	38
Teachers	27
Volunteers	22
Other personnel	25

Bilingual staff are most commonly used directly in instruction (42% of the programs have bilingual aides, 27% have bilingual teachers). One-third of the programs employ bilingual counselors and about one-fourth use bilingual volunteers and other personnel.

The training and experience required of English language teachers were also indicated by local service providers (LD3). Survey respondents were asked to identify requirements for both full-time and part-time teaching positions. Table 13 summarires these requirements for all responding programs.

Table 13

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR FULL-TIME TEACHERS
(n=232)

Requirement Areas	Percentage of all Local Service Providers
A.A. degree	0.0
B.A. degree	38.8
Teaching certificate	22.8
M.A. degree	7.3
ESL certificate	3.4
Other specialization or endorsement	4.3
One-year relevant experience	11.2
Two-three years relevant experience	9.5
Four or more years relevant experience	1.3

The most frequent requirements for full-time teachers are a baccalaureate degree and a teaching certificate. Only 53% of the local service providers noted any requirement at all for full-time teacher positions in their English language training programs.

Table 14 provides the parallel requirements for part-time teachers. Again, results are displayed for all local service providers.

Table 14

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR PART-TIME TEACHERS
(n=232)

Requirement Areas	Percentage of all Local Service Providers Having Requirements
A.A. degree	3.4
B.A. degree	47.0
Teaching certificate	24.6
M.A. degree	1.3
ESL certificate	4.3
Other specialization or endorsement	4.3
One-year relevant experience	19.4
Two-three years relevant experience	7.8
Four or more years relevant experience	1.3

Further comparisons of Tables 13 and 14 show that requirements for part-time teachers generally equal or exceed those for full time teaching positions. Part-time teachers are more frequently expected to hold a baccalaureate degree and teaching credential, as well as having at least one year of relevant experience. Full-time teachers are more likely to have a master's degree, but this may well reflect general educational requirements expected within an educational organization, such as a community college and vocational/technical institute.

The percentage of paid teachers who are full-time was compared to several other program characteristics. Three relationships emerged. Programs which place an institutional emphasis on Job Services and Employment have a greater number of full-time teachers. Finally, community colleges tend to have fewer full-time teachers.

8. How large are the ORR-funded refugee English language training programs?

Local service providers were asked to indicate the number of locations at which their organization offers English language training to refugees (LA1). Whereas 44% of the 226 respondents indicated that services were available only at the primary site, while an additional 20% of the respondents use two locations, 10% use three locations for English language training. The remaining one-fourth use four or more sites for training.

Local programs enrolled a median of 190 refugees in FY 1981 and 177 refugees in FY 1982 (LC1). This slight drop in enrollment is not reflected in a comparison of the median attendance of refugees in the first week of March in 1981 and 1982 (LC2). Median program attendance remained relatively stable between the two years: 71 in FY 81 and 75 in FY 82.

No significant differences in attendance or enrollment figures exist among the various types of organizations offering instruction.

During March 1982, ORR-funded English language training programs offered an average of 23 classes per term, typically six parallel sections at each of four levels (LE2). These levels more often represent gradations of English proficiency, (e.g., beginning, intermediate, advanced), than differentiation of instructional purpose. Class size averages 15 students.

9. What is the intensity of English language instruction for refugee adults?

The English language training programs described the duration, intensity and enrollment of their courses during March 1982, (LE2). Classes are conducted an average of three hours per day, four days per week for 15 weeks per term. The typical course in an English language training program offers 160 hours of instruction. When total enrollments of individual sections are summed over courses, total program enrollments have a median average of 87 during the term. Nearly all of the enrolled students are refugees--70% of the programs responding to the survey question indicated that their course enrollments are composed exclusively of refugees. The

remaining 30% of the programs enroll a median of 26 non-refugee students. Thus, ORR-funded English language training classes predominately serve refugees.

10. What factors tend to differentiate refugee English language training programs?

A factor analysis was conducted of the survey items which describe local refugee English language training programs. The factor analysis identifies clusters of related program characteristics. These clusters represent major "types" of programs. Thirty-four different program characteristics were considered; from these, four major factors were identified. These factors together account for more than 40 percent of the variation among all of the program characteristics examined. The four factors in descending order of magnitude are: (1) program size, as measured by the total amount of funds received from ORR, refugee student enrollment, and number of course offerings; (2) program emphasis upon employment, measured by the availability of job placement services, and the instructional emphasis given to job services and employment; (3) degree of a program's internal coordination and external linkage, as measured by degree of service mix in the program and its coordination with other services and (4) program emphasis on vocational ESL, as measured by the program's instructional emphasis on vocational English and job-specific English and by its linkage with vocational training.

These four factors represent the chief dimensions along which refugee English language training programs are most consistently differentiated. The impact of these factors on program outcomes is discussed in Section D, Factors Relating to Program Quality and Success.

B. The Resources and Costs Involved in English Language Training for Refugees

More than 98 percent of the funds administered by state coordinating offices for refugee English language training come from the Office of Refugee Resettlement. Adult Basic Education monies are the most common source used to supplement refugee English language training, with about half of the local service providers using such funds. Funding per program declined from an average of $56,110 in FY 81 to $45,621 in FY 82.

Funds are distributed by states primarily by grants and contracts let through a request for proposal process. In addition, interagency agreements are commonly used by states to allocate the funds. Only one-third of the states have policies earmarking ORR social service funds for English language training.

About three-fourths of the funds for English language training are devoted directly to instructional costs. The remainder is evenly divided between costs for support services and administration. The median cost per student instructional hour increased 16 percent from $2.00 in FY 81 to $2.31 in FY 82.

1. What sources of funds are devoted to English language training for refugees?

States which administer ORR-supported programs were asked to estimate the amount of money received from various sources for English language training of refugees (SA1). The proportion of funds, by source, for FY 1981 and 1982 are summarized in Table 15.

Table 15

MEDIAN PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS FROM VARIOUS SOURCES ADMINISTERED BY STATES FOR REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING, BY YEAR
(n = 28)

Source	FY 1981	FY 1982
Office of Refugee Resettlement	98.2	98.7
Adult Basic Education	0.5	0.1
Comprehensive Employment & Training Act	0.3	0.0
Other public sources	0.6	0.2
Private foundations	0.0	0.2
Voluntary agencies	0.1	0.0
Mutual Assistance Associations	0.0	0.0
Other non-public sources	0.2	0.3
Donated and in-kind sources	0.2	0.4
TOTAL	$389,000	$448,000

As can be seen in the table, essentially all funds administered by state coordinator offices which support local refugee English language training are from the Office of Refugee Resettlement. The actual dollar values are not displayed here since results are available on this item for only 28 of the states. Nearly one fourth (22%) of the states responding to the survey did not complete the items dealing with sources of English language training program funds. Apparently some state coordinators find it difficult to identify the various sources of funding which support refugee English language training. This is understandable since a variety of funding sources are administered by various state coordinator offices for different programs which may serve refugees, such as adult basic education programs and CETA training and job development programs.

A parallel question about sources of funds was asked of local service providers (LB4). Table 16 compares program estimates of the percentage of funds of non-ORR sources for FY 1981 and 1982.

Table 16

PERCENTAGE OF LOCAL PROGRAMS USING VARIOUS NON-ORR FUNDS FOR REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING, BY YEAR
(n = 134)

Source	FY 1981	FY 1982
Adult Basic Education	52.2	49.6
Local in-kind sources	44.0	43.0
CETA	32.8	27.4
General funds	26.9	31.1
Other federal sources	19.4	20.0
Other state sources	18.7	22.2
Private foundations	9.7	13.3
CETA	0.7	2.2

Adult Basic Education funds are most commonly used by local service providers to support English language training for refugees. About one-half of the ORR-funded programs supplement their effort with these ABE monies. Over the two fiscal years, the percentage of programs using CETA funds declined sharply with a concomitant increase in the use of the institution's general funds, other state sources and private foundation grants. A substantial percentage (58%) of the local service providers indicated that funds other than those from ORR are used. For FY 81, non-ORR funds represent a median of 25% of the total refugee English language training program resources. This median percentage climbed to 30% in FY 82, apparently reflecting the decline in ORR funds received. Indeed, when local programs were asked the amount of ORR funds received during the two years (LB3), the median dropped from $56,110 in FY 81 to $45,621 in FY 82 for the 180 programs which operated in both years.

The percentage and amount of ORR funds received by local service providers in the 15 states with the largest refugee populations are compared with figures for all programs in Table 17 below.

Table 17

MEDIAN PERCENTAGE AND AMOUNT OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM ORR BY REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

	All Programs (n = 192)	Programs in 15 States with Largest Refugee Population (n = 107)
Median percent of refugee English language training program funds from ORR	70	67
Median amount of ORR funds per program	$45,621	$60,000

Programs in impacted areas receive somewhat more ORR funds, but the proportion of a program's funds received from ORR does not differ significantly in these states.

An estimate was made of the total funds devoted to ORR-supported refugee English language training nationally in FY 82. The total funds and ORR funds reported by each of the 191 responding local service providers were extrapolated to all 327 ORR-supported providers of refugee English language training in the nation. While these national estimates can be made with some degree of confidence, estimates for individual states cannot be made with sufficient accuracy. For FY 82, it is estimated that $52,250,631 were devoted by ORR-funded local service providers to refugee English language training. It is estimated that $29,201,062 (56%) of these funds originated from the Office of Refugee

Resettlement. This means that about 43% of the FY 82 ORR social service dollars ($67,571,000) were directly applied to refugee English language training for achieving self-sufficiency. Thus, a substantial proportion of ORR dollars are being devoted to English language training, augmented by a substantial amount from other sources as well.

In addition to reporting actual dollars, state coordinators estimated the total volunteer hours devoted to refugee English language training (SA2). For the 15 states responding to this item, the average number of volunteer hours increased from 8,920 in FY 81 to 11,912 in FY 82.

2. How are these funds allocated from the state level to the local level?

State coordinators were asked if they had policies which directed a specified proportion of ORR social service funds to English language training (SC1). Only 36 percent of the 35 respondents indicated that such a policy is used in their state. For states having such policies, a median of 52% of ORR funds is dedicated to English language training. However, the individual state percentages ranged widely, from as low as 14 percent to as high as 100 percent.

State coordinators were also asked to indicate the type of service procurement procedures they utilized for refugee English language training (SC4). Thirty-four states responded to the question. Two-thirds (67.6%) use a competitive request for proposal process. About one-fourth (26.5%) accept unsolicited proposals as well. A few (8.8%) of the states use the request for bid process. Nearly one-third (29.4%) noted other procurement procedures, which are generally sole-source agreements with other state agencies either to provide services directly or to subcontract for them. State education agencies are most often used in this way. Another procurement method is a continuing service agreement. Two-thirds (68.6%) of the state coordinators allow contractors to subcontract for English language training (SC5).

3. How are funds used by English language training programs?

Local service providers use refugee English language training funds to meet a variety of direct and indirect costs. Programs were asked to designate the percentage of their funds expended for various purposes (LB1). Table 18 provides a summary of their responses.

Table 18

MEAN PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS FOR REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS PURPOSES, BY YEAR (n = 175)

Cost	FY 1981	FY 1982
Direct instruction	71	71
Support services	13	14
Administration	16	15

More than two-thirds (71%) of the refugee English language training funds directly support instructional services, such as teacher salaries. The remaining 30% is divided nearly equally between administrative and support service costs. The distribution of these costs remained essentially the same during the two fiscal years. The decline in total dollars did not affect the proportion of funds devoted to instructional costs.

When the proportion of funds devoted to instruction is compared to other program characteristics, several relationships emerge. The greater the range of refugee services and the higher the proportion of refugee clientele, the lower the percentage of funds devoted to instructional costs. Thus, multiservice organizations which predominately work with refugees devote a smaller portion of funds to language instruction and more to other services. The data also indicate that vocational-technical schools devote a greater proportion of their language training funds to direct instruction than do other types of organizations.

Another way of looking at the cost of English language training is to determine the cost per student instructional hour. This value provides an index of the relative cost of delivering English language training program services (LB2). The median reported cost per student instructional hour is compared for the two fiscal years in Table 19.

The data within Table 19 indicates that the cost per student instructional hour has increased somewhat over the two years, although the increase would be much smaller if the effects of general inflation are considered. Some of the 16% increase in costs per student instructional hour may be associated with an increase in instructional costs, such as teacher salaries, or a decrease in class size.

Table 19

MEDIAN COST PER STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL HOUR FOR REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING, BY YEAR
(n = 144)

	FY 1981	FY 1982
All programs	$2.00	$2.31

Overall cost per student instructional hour was compared to the organizational type of local service provider. No significant differences exist in the costs among the types of organizations providing refugee English language training.

C. Characteristics of Refugees Engaged in English Language Training

During FY 81, local service providers enrolled an average of 190 adult refugees in English language training programs. Enrollment declined to an average of 177 in FY 82. Most refugees are enrolled in relatively large programs which serve more than 150 students per year. Three-fourths of the refugee enrollments are in the 15 states having the largest population of refugees.

About 58 percent of the refugee students are male. In FY 82, 70 percent of the refugee students were under the age of 40, compared to 87 percent of adult refugees nationally in this age category. This suggests that the programs tend to serve a slightly older segment of the adult population. The students' ethnicity in FY 82 is as follows: More than one-third (36.4%) of the refugee students are Vietnamese, followed by Lao (18.8%), Khmer (15.6%), Chinese-Vietnamese (13.2%) and Hmong (10.5%). Haitian and Cuban entrants together represent less than one percent of the total refugee student body and Soviet refugees represent less than one-half of one percent. Over the two years, the proportion of Vietnamese, Khmer, and Chinese students grew, while proportions of Lao, Hmong and Mien students declined.

A substantial proportion (15.2%) of refugee adults enrolled in English language training have had no previous formal education, with an additional one-half who have had a very limited formal education. Only one-third (35.7%) of the students have had more than six years of formal schooling. The percentage of students with little or no

previous education declined from FY 81 to FY 82. The percentage of refugee students having limited prior education is greater in the 15 states with the greatest numbers of refugees.

For FY 82, local service providers reported that 81.2 percent of the refugee students are literate in some language, up by more than five percent from the previous year. Essentially one in five adult refugee students have had no experience with either the formal schooling process or written language.

More than half (57.6%) of the currently enrolled refugee students arrived in the United States within the previous twelve months. Nearly three-fourths (70%) are unemployed, compared to 78.7 percent of the refugee students unemployed in FY 81. Programs which use employment status as an admissions priority naturally tend to serve a greater number of employed adults.

One-half of the state agencies responding to the survey use local refugee population density as a criteria for funds allocation policies, thereby targeting English language training funds to impacted areas.

Three-fourths of the local service providers do not have waiting lists for refugees to enroll in English language training. Where waiting lists exist, an average of 204 students wait five and one-half weeks to enter the programs. In size, waiting lists are about 11 percent of the total student enrollment. Total program enrollment is correlated with waiting list length, such that the greater the enrollment, the longer the list. The use of admissions priorities appears to have little influence on waiting lists.

Three-fourths of the local service providers use an open-entry policy so that students may enroll in English language training classes at any time during the term.

Students' individual characteristics are recognized as influencing their participation in English language training. Demographic, economic and affective factors inhibit students' participation in the program and the learning process.

1. How many refugees are receiving English language training?

Local service providers reported their total enrollment of adult refugee students in English language training for FY 81 and FY 82 (LC1). The 203 programs responding enrolled an average of 190 refugee adults in FY 81, and 177 in FY 82. In FY 82, the 203 local service providers responding to the survey enrolled a total of 98,964 adult refugees. By extrapolating survey respondents' enrollments, it is estimated that 149,890 refugees were served in ORR-funded English language training during FY 82.

When refugee enrollment is categorized by programs' relative size, the relatively large programs (enrollment greater than 300) account for 35% of refugee students. Table 20 provides a summary of refugee enrollments for FY 81 and FY 82 by program size.

Table 20

PERCENTAGE OF REFUGEES ENROLLED IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS, BY SIZE AND YEAR
(n = 203)

Program Size	FY 81	FY 82
Small (50-)	20	19
Medium (51-150)	22	27
Large (151-300)	23	19
Very Large (301+)	35	35

As can be seen in Table 20, the relative proportions of refugees served by large and small programs have not changed appreciably. In FY 82, a slightly greater segment of the refugee population was served by medium-sized programs. Refugee enrollment in the 115 programs in the 15 states having the greatest numbers of refugees account for 77% and 75% of all refugee students in FY 81 and FY 82, respectively.

2. What are the characteristics of these students?

Local service providers were asked to provide actual or estimated percentages of the composition of their refugee students by sex, age, ethnicity, formal education, literacy, length of time in U.S. and employment status (LC7). Information was requested for both FY 81 and FY 82. In aggregating these data, percentages reported by the local service providers have been weighted by their corresponding refugee enrollments to estimate the overall proportions for all adult refugee students. The distributions of students by sex are shown below in Table 21.

Table 21

SEX OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS, BY YEAR
(n = 169)

FY 81		FY 82	
Percent Male	Percent Female	Percent Male	Percent Female
58	42	58	42

The sex distribution of refugee students does not vary appreciably by year. In FY 82, approximately 52% of the adult refugee population in the U.S. was male*, thus a slightly greater proportion of males are being served in English language training.

*Age/Sex Report for May 1982, Office of Refugee Resettlement

The sex distribution of refugee students enrolled in programs where the heads of household were reportedly given high entry priority was compared to those programs where no such priority was reported. In FY 82, 63% of the 93 programs having no priority enrolled more than the median percentage of males (58%), while 58% of the 57 programs having head of household as a priority exceeded the median percentage of males. Thus, entry priority has little relationship to the sex distribution of participants, even though such would be assumed to be the case. The sex distribution of refugee students was similarly compared to programs which did and did not set admissions priorities on the basis of students' employment status. Again, essentially identical results were found, with a slightly greater proportion of males served by programs having no admissions priorities.

In terms of age, refugee students served in FY 82 were slightly younger than those served in FY 81, with 70% of the FY 82 students under the age of 35, compared to 65% in FY 81. Table 22 displays the age distribution of students served each year. As a benchmark, 87% of the entire adult refugee population is under the age of 35 compared to only 65% of all refugee students.* This suggests that the English Language training programs tend to serve slightly older adults.

Table 22

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS, BY YEAR
(n = 104)

Age	-24	25-34	35-44	45+
FY 81	27	38	24	11

Age	-24	25-34	35-44	45+
FY 82	31	39	19	11

*Age/Sex Report for May 1982, Office of Refugee Resettlement

The ethnic distribution of adult refugee students was also reported by the local service providers. Table 23, shown below, displays the distribution of refugees by ethnicity for each year.

Table 23

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS, BY YEAR

Year/Ethnicity	Vietnamese	Chinese/Vietnamese	Khmer (Cambodian)	Lao	Hmong	Mien	Haitian	Cuban	Soviet	Other
FY 81	32.9	11.4	11.3	19.8	18.8	2.4	*	0.6	0.5	2.3
FY 82	36.4	13.2	15.6	18.8	10.5	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.4	3.4

*Less than 0.1 present

Ethnic Vietnamese are the largest adult refugee student population, representing about one-third of the enrollment in FY 81 (32.9%) and in FY 82 (36.4%). Ethnic Lao students are the second largest group (19.8%) in FY 81, but declined slightly in FY 82. In a parallel fashion, the proportion of Hmong students declined from 18.8% in FY 81 to 10.5% in FY 82. On the other hand, both the Khmer and Chinese-Vietnamese student enrollments increased from FY 81 to FY 82. Together the Haitian, Cuban and Soviet refugee student population represented less than two percent of the enrollment in either year.

Table 24 displays the refugee students' years of formal education in their country of origin.

Table 24

DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS' FORMAL EDUCATION IN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN, BY YEAR
(n = 124)

	Percentage of Students Having Different Number of Years of Formal Education				
	None	1-3	4-6	7-12	13+
FY 81	22.3	19.0	28.2	26.0	4.5
FY 82	15.2	19.6	29.5	31.5	4.2

As can be seen in Table 24, a substantial proportion of refugee adults have very limited prior educational experience. About two-fifths (41.3%) of the students served in FY 81 had three years or less formal education. Even fewer (34.8%) of the students served in FY 82 had a third-grade education.

The percentage of refugee students served in FY 81 having more than a 6th grade education (7 or more years) in their country of origin is less than one-third (30.5%), but increased slightly (35.7%) in FY 82. Again we see that the programs served a slightly more educated refugee population in FY 82. Even so, the diversity of the educational backgrounds of these adult refugee students is considerable. English language training programs serve a very heterogeneous client population, some of whom have had no prior formal education (15.2%), only a basic education (49.1%) and more than a 6th grade education (35.7%)

Some students with limited or no formal education may nevertheless be literate in some language. Table 25 summarizes the percentage of refugee students who are literate in some language.

Table 25

LITERACY OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS, BY YEAR
(n = 159)

Percent Literate in Some Language

FY 81	FY 82
75.5	81.2

In FY 81, roughly three-fourths of the adult refugee students were literate in some language. This increased to about four-fifths in FY 82, again reflecting an increase in the educational background of the refugee population and/or a proportionate decrease in enrollment of non-literate students. At the same time, the data also suggests that nearly one-fourth of the adult refugee population is not literate in any language. Considering both literacy and formal education, the FY 82 findings suggest that English language training programs must deal with a substantial population (about 20%) which has neither experience with the formal educational process nor with literacy in any language.

The recency of refugee students arrival in the U.S. was reported by local service providers as well. Table 26 exhibits the students' length of residence in the United States.

Table 26

ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS' LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES, BY YEAR (n = 125)

	Percentage of Students Residing in the U.S. for Various Numbers of Months						
	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	36+
FY 81	32.7	28.2	17.9	11.4	4.7	2.7	2.3
FY 82	30.5	27.1	15.1	16.6	5.3	2.7	2.6

More than half (60.9% and 57.6%) of the refugees enrolled in FY 81 and FY 82 had arrived within the past 12 months. Slightly fewer students had arrived within the previous twelve months in FY 82 than in FY 81. Most importantly, the results indicate that the refugee adults are gaining early access to English language training. Nearly one-third of the students enroll within six months of arrival, while less that ten percent of the total adult refugee population in the nation had arrived in the first six months of FY 82.

The final demographic characteristic reported by local service providers concerns the employment status of adult refugee students. Table 27 shows the percentage of adult refugees served each fiscal year who were employed.

Table 27

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS, BY YEAR
(n = 125)

	Employed		Unemployed
Year/Employment Status	Full Time	Part-Time	
FY 81	11.5	9.8	78.7
FY 82	15.5	14.4	70.0

A large proportion of refugee students are unemployed. More than three-fourths (78.7%) were unemployed in FY 81. Despite the national rise in unemployment, the unemployment rate of adult refugee students fell to 70% in FY 82.

When the unemployment rate of refugee students was compared for programs which used employment status as an admissions priority, it was found that they serve a substantially smaller proportion of unemployed adult refugees.

3. What factors influence refugee participation in English language training?

The major factors which influence refugee participation in English language training are two-fold. First, program characteristics affect refugee access and entry into training. These program characteristics include policies, admissions priorities and instructional configuration. Characteristics of the refugees themselves and the circumstances in which they are living also influence participation in English language training. These two factors are discussed at length in the remainder of this section.

Although most states do not use funding formulas for English language training (SC7), 58 percent of the 36 state coordinators responding to the survey indicated that policies are used to allocate funds to geographic areas. The local refugee population density is by far the most common criteria used, with one-half of all respondents using this allocation policy. The number of new arrivals, public

assistance caseload and unemployment rate are also used, but less often. Many states have thus established policies which target refugee English language training funds to highly impacted geographic areas.

Most (74%) of the local service providers responding to the survey did not have a waiting list of refugees to enter their English language training program (LCs) in March 1982. For the remaining 26% which did have a waiting list, students waited an average of 5.5 weeks to enter the training program. An average of 204 students were on waiting lists in these 60 programs during the week of March 1, 1982. In all, the 60 programs reported a total of 10,626 adult refugees waiting to enter programs. These waiting refugees represent eleven percent of the enrollment of all programs responding.

This average is skewed by rather large waiting lists reported for programs in two states. Thirteen programs in California had 2,505 refugees waiting and five programs in Minnesota had 6,254 refugees awaiting entry. Since these are states with very large refugee populations, a comparison was made between size of enrollment and length of waiting list. A correlation of +.46 was found, which reflects a moderate relationship between program enrollment and waiting list size. It may be that the diversity of the local refugee population is the critical factor here.

A comparison was also made between the length of time students remain on waiting lists and the admissions priorities of English language training programs. While 44 percent of the programs have admissions priorities of one form or another, less than one-fourth of these programs have waiting lists. Slightly more programs (29%) which do not have admissions priorities also have waiting lists. However, the difference between these two types of programs is too small to conclude with confidence that improved admissions priorities could reduce waiting lists.

Another program characteristic which influences refugees' access to English language training are constraints on the time or manner in which students may enroll in specific courses of instruction (LE5). Seventy-six percent of the 219 local service providers responding indicated that the refugee student may enroll and enter the classes at any time during the term. An additional twelve percent said that the student may enter the class only at its beginning and eleven percent indicated entry is on a space available basis.

A comparison was made between these entry policies and the length of the waiting list, to determine if service open-entry programs tend to have shorter waiting lists. However, no significant relationship was found between these two factors.

As a whole, the results suggest that adult refugees have broad access to English language programs, but for one-fourth of the programs, many students will have to wait to gain entry.

Thus far, the discussion has focused upon program-related factors which influence refugee participation. A second set of factors deal with the characteristics of the adult refugees themselves. In open-ended questions (SG3 and SJ2), respondents identified the major factors which inhibit the success of English language training programs, particularly for Southeast Asian refugees with little previous education.* Among their numerous responses, state and local respondents identified several characteristics of refugees which constrain their participation in English language training.

In descending order of frequency, student limitations mentioned include age, lack of literacy, lack of study skills, gender, inter-ethnic hostility, and lack of contact with English speakers. Economic barriers were also mentioned, including lack of transportation and child care, unrealistic

*Although the survey addressed English language training for all refugees, this section focused exclusively on programs serving Southeast Asians.

employment goals, transiency and work-related fatigue.

Affective factors reported include culture shock, mental health problems, family problems, fear, stress and concern for relatives remaining in Southeast Asia. These findings further reinforce the point that adult refugees are not always in a good position to learn English because of all the factors which affect their daily lives. Indeed, when survey respondents were asked to identify what factors contribute to successful English language training, state coordinators and local service providers identified a number of factors which directly deal with refugee characteristics--differential instruction for literate and preliterate students, services integrated with case management, culturally sensitive and compassionate staff, available child care, transportation and bilingual aides and cultural orientation.

D. Factors Relating to Program Quality and Success

The survey examined the kinds of information being collected concerning program performance, the extent to which the English language training programs can demonstrate their effectiveness, characteristics which are associated with successful program performance and the program efforts which are currently under way to improve programs.

Standards and guidelines for program operation are in effect for most English language training programs. State coordinators indicated that standards generally exist for program evaluation, staff training and qualifications, and program design. Most local service providers have their own guidelines for instructional materials and methods, program design, student assessment, staff training and qualifications and program evaluation. Most state coordinators and local agencies have standards for program performance in effect or feel that such standards could be usefully and feasibly implemented, particularly regarding costs per student instructional hour.

Nearly all (94%) of the state coordinators responding routinely collect information from local service providers. This information, however, is limited to data about funds, student characteristics and program descriptors. Less than half of the states collect program evaluation findings which could provide evidence of program effectiveness.

Essentially all state coordinators monitor their local English language training programs for fiscal, compliance and technical assistance purposes. Only about one-third of the states responding conduct impact evaluations of their programs. State coordinators noted that information is not usually gathered to assess the degree to which English language training programs improve refugees' language proficiency, employment and

self-sufficiency. The student records maintained in English language training programs usually do not include two of the characteristics which previous research shows affect acquisition--prior schooling and literacy. Most programs conduct assessments for student placement and progress, but only about half of the programs use formal, standardized tests. Thus, the evidence which could be used to document program outcomes and effectiveness is relatively limited at both the state and local levels.

Some indicators of program performance were provided by local service providers in the survey. English language training programs report an average completion rate of 50.1% for refugee students. Vocational-technical schools have the highest average rate (65%), whereas high school adult education programs have the lowest (41%). Completion rate is correlated with the instructional emphasis of the program and the manner in which instruction is differentiated on the basis of student characteristics. Programs estimate that it takes refugees an average of 661 instructional hours or eleven months to complete an English language training program. Vocational-technical schools' estimates are lower: fewer hours are needed to complete their program of instruction. Naturally, a program's duration depends on both the characteristics of its students and its instructional objectives, so comparisons among programs are difficult to interpret.

Since both refugees' backgrounds and programs' instructional goals vary so widely, local service providers were asked to estimate the number of instructional hours required for various prototypic refugee students to attain specified levels of English proficiency: "survival," "conversational" and "independent job search." The estimates for the four

refugee students varied tremendously but systematically, demonstrating the effect of student characteristics on instructional efficiency. Differences among these students were as great as 750 hours, reflecting a difference in estimated instructional cost of more than $2000 per student. Community colleges estimate the greatest number of hours (and hence cost) for prototypical students to reach these levels of proficiency.

The shorter the total program duration, the higher the student completion rate. Of course, this may have no bearing on the actual level of language proficiency represented by program completion. The greater the program's instructional intensity in hours per week, the higher the student completion rate. Open-entry programs and programs which do not stress literacy as a goal experience lower completion rates. Community colleges have higher completion rates, as do programs which emphasize literacy. Programs which focus on job services or job-specific English and programs which differentiate instruction on the basis of ethnicity have higher departure rates. However, the program completion rate is not necessarily a reliable measure of outcome, since many people who leave early go to jobs and other programs.

During a given term, 64% of the refugees successfully complete their current course of instruction. Thirty percent of the refugee students leave the program during or after a given term, but these departures are for positive reasons--employment, program completion, or enrollment in vocational training or an academic program.

A series of analyses identified two factors associated with these indicators of program success: the percentage of full-time teachers and the number of instructional hours per week are both positively related to

student completion rates. In addition, the level of student unemployment is positively correlated with program completion, perhaps reflecting how opportunities for training influence participation, or perhaps other motivational factors. The instructional emphasis of the program influences its indicators of performance. However, it is equally important to note that program size, refugee/non-refugee client mix and service mix were not systematically related to program outcomes.

A wide range of program improvement efforts are under way, involving technical assistance, staff development and program coordination efforts. These represent positive steps being taken to enhance refugee English language training.

About two-thirds of the local service providers requested technical assistance in FY 82, primarily in the areas of instructional materials, staff development, curriculum design and student assessment. Eighty-eight percent of their numerous requests were fulfilled, primarily by the Center for Applied Linguistics, other local service providers and state agencies.

Staff development efforts are common, but the use of ORR funds for these purposes have declined. Staff training is generally conducted in-house or by state coordinators or professional associations.

Coordinative linkages are maintained with key state and local services by the majority of the programs, particulary with welfare, job placement and vocational training. Linkages with other agencies dealing with refugee affairs are less common. Although inter-program and multi-service linkages are recognized as important, a substantial segment of the English language training programs does not maintain close ties with other services.

1. What evidence is available concerning program performance?

The quality of program performance is a relative question which can only be answered in reference to some identifiable standards or guidelines. One item on both the state (SE1) and local (LI1) questionnaires deals with the types of standards and guidelines which are in effect and the types which could be usefully and feasibly implemented in the future. Such standards might help set expectations for program performance.

Table 28 compares state and local respondents' perceptions of program performance standards.

Table 28

PERCENTAGE OF STATE COORDINATORS (n=22) AND LOCAL PROGRAMS (n=204) INDICATING THE EXISTENCE AND FEASIBILITY OF PROGRAM STANDARDS

	% Indicating Standard Currently Exists		% Indicating a Standard Could Be Usefully and Feasibly Implemented	
Program Standard/Guideline	State	Program	State	Program
Instructional materials/methods	22.7%	82.4%	40.9%	10.8%
Staff training and qualifications	42.1%	77.0%	31.6%	16.74%
Cost per student hour	31.61%	52.1%	52.6%	20.6%
Program design	35.3%	83.4%	41.2%	9.5%
Student assessment	27.8%	83.9%	38.9%	11.27%
Program evaluation	41.2%	75.4%	47.1%	19.1%
Prioritizing student entry	37.5%	60.6%	50.0%	12.6%

The data in Table 28 indicate that standards and guidelines are in effect in most programs. However, only about one-third of the responding states have such standards. Standards have thus been established mostly at the local level. Where a given standard is not in effect, a substantial proportion of respondents feel that a standard or guidelines could be usefully and feasibly implemented. Combining the percentage of respondents which have standards with the percentage which feel that standards could be put into effect, we see that more than two-thirds of the state agencies and four-fifths of the local programs use or desire to use standards for program operation.

A second necessary condition for assessing program quality is the availability of systematic information about program objectives and outcomes. State coordinators identified what information they routinely collect from English language training programs (SD2). Table 29 summarizes their responses to this question.

Table 29

PROGRAM INFORMATION CURRENTLY COLLECTED BY STATES
(n = 34)

Information Categories	Percentage of States Collecting This Information
A. Program Description	
1. Goals	91.2%
2. Number of instructional hours	91.2%
3. Levels of instruction	79.4%
4. Linkage with employment/vocational training programs	73.5%
5. Setting	73.5%
6. Instructional methods	70.6%
7. Student-instructor notes	70.6%
8. Materials used	67.6%
9. Course offering	67.6%
10. Assessment and training procedures	64.7%
11. Student placement procedures	61.8%
12. Inservice training for staff	58.8%
13. Technical assistance used	52.9%
B. Program Outcomes	
1. Tests/instruments used for program evaluation	61.8%
2. Tests used to evaluate student progress	61.8%
3. Program evaluation design	50.0%
4. Program evaluation results	47.1%

Table 29
Continued

Information Categories (con't)	Percentage of States Collecting This Information
C. Student Characteristics	
1. Numbers	94.1%
2. Public assistance status	85.3%
3. Employment status	67.6%
4. Ethnic/gender/age composition	58.8%
5. Entering English ability	55.9%
6. Previous education	50.0%
7. Previous literacy	41.2%
D. Funding/Cost Information	
1. ORR funds	91.2%
2. Cost per instructional hour	67.6%
3. Cost per student	67.6%
4. Other federal funds	32.4%
5. Nature and value of in-kind services	26.5%
6. State funds	26.5%
7. Private funds	23.5%

Ninety-four percent of the state coordinators responding to the survey routinely collect information from their local service providers. Most often, the information collected describes program plans and student characteristics. Far fewer states collect information about program outcomes and non-ORR sources of funds.

All but one of the 36 state agencies routinely monitor their English language training programs (SD1), primarily for fiscal, compliance and technical assistance purposes. Impact evaluations are conducted by about one-third (37.1%) of the respondents. Thus, both the focus of the information collected and the information gathering process itself tend <u>not</u> to be oriented to program performance and student outcomes.

Local service providers were asked to describe the information routinely included in refugee student records (LC8). Table 30 summarizes the information most commonly collected about refugee students.

Table 30

INFORMATION MAINTAINED BY LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS
IN REFUGEE STUDENT RECORDS
(n = 221)

Type of Information	Percentage of Programs Maintaining Information
Sex	96.8%
Age	95.0%
Native Language	87.3%
Length of Time in Program	86.4%
U.S. Arrival Date	81.4%
Employment Status	81.0%
Previous Schooling Prior to Arrival	74.7%
Literacy in Native or Other Tongue	68.8%
Public Assistance Status	68.3%
Other Languages Spoken	60.2%

Virtually all programs responding collect basic demographic information about the refugee student. However, only about three-fourths collect information about the students' prior schooling and two-thirds about the students' literacy. Since such factors should influence instructional planning (Reder 1981, Robson, 1981), it is important that this information is available.

Additional questions were asked of local service providers about the methods used for student placement and progress appraisal (LG 1-2). Essentially all (98.6%) local service providers assess student placement and progress, primarily through informal observation of classroom performance. However, about half do use published, standardized examinations for placement (56.6%) and progress appraisal (46.8%). Although student evaluation is considered important and is conducted by nearly all local service providers, the methods used are not necessarily either formal or standardized.

2. To what extent have English language training programs demonstrated their effectiveness?

Although the overall purpose of the ORR study was to assess the effect of English language training for refugees, the mail survey can only respond to this question in

a limited manner. Subsequent phases of the study have been undertaken to assess these outcomes more directly.

The local service provider questionnaire provides a range of information about the flow of refugees through English language training. No information was collected, however, about the direct relationship between refugee English language training and economic self-sufficiency, the topic of another research project being conducted by ORR.

Local service providers were asked to estimate the percentage of refugees enrolled who eventually complete the entire refugee English language training program (LE3). The 159 service providers responding to the question show a median refugee completion rate of 50.1%.

The reported completion rate was compared to 22 other program chacteristics to identify the factors which influence refugees' completion of the programs. One characteristic proved to be particularly significant--the type of organization providing the service.

Vocational-technical institutes reported the highest average completion rate (65%), whereas high school adult education programs reported the lowest rate (41.4%). Other types of institutions reported intermediate completion rates. Community colleges reported 46% and voluntary agencies, 51%. Overall, about one-half of the refugees entering English language training complete the program of instruction.

Other factors were associated with this outcome. The percentage of full-time teachers, the emphasis given to literacy and the differentiation of instruction on the basis of refugee employment statistics were positively correlated to completion rate, while an emphasis on reading and writing skills had a negative relationship with completion rate.

Local service providers also estimated the number of months required for these students to complete the program (LE4). The 157 respondents to this item estimated a median of 11 months or about 661 instructional hours for the "average" refugee to complete an English language training program. The majority of the responses ranged from seven months to fifteen months. The range of responses points to a potential problem when the limits imposed on English language training participants are considered. As noted in a previous section, nearly all (86.7%) of the state coordinators responding to the survey impose time limits on the total length of time refugees may participate in English language training. One-fourth of the respondents impose limits of less than eleven months, effectively constraining refugees' opportunity to complete English language training programs. When months required to complete are compared with the type of organization providing English language training, no significant differences emerge. Again, a wide variety of other program characteristics were compared with this outcome variable, but no clear cut differences were found.

An overall program completion rate of 50% was noted earlier. Local service providers also reported the course completion rate of students for the current term. Local service providers report a median completion rate of 64% in their courses, slightly higher than the overall program completion rate.

The influence of a number of course characteristics was examined on program completion rate. Several relationships emerged. Not surprisingly, the shorter the total program duration, the higher the completion rate. Furthermore, the greater the instructional intensity in hours per week, the higher the completion rate. This suggests that short-term, intensive training programs have higher completion rates, but it does not mean that short-term intensive training is more effective in terms of English proficiency levels actually achieved. Other program factors are related

to student departure rate as well. A greater proportion of students depart from those programs which emphasize job services and job-specific English, while fewer students leave programs which emphasize literacy training. Organizationally, community colleges have significantly lower departure rates than other service providers. When ethnicity is used to differentiate instruction, departure rates increase.

Comparing or evaluating programs only in terms of such measures of "flow through the system" (i.e., program completion rate and duration) is problematic because different programs serve distinct subpopulations of refugees and often have varying instructional goals. There is neither an "average" refugee student nor a standard set of instructional goals for refugee English language training programs throughout the nation. If student characteristics and program objectives could be held constant, then reasonable comparisons and evaluations could be made of programs' performance. As a first attempt to do this, local service providers estimated on the basis of their programs' experience, the number of instructional hours required by each of four prototypic refugees to achieve each of three defined levels of language proficiency students. Table 31 describes the four adult refugee student prototypes and displays the median estimate of instructional hours required for each to achieve the various levels of language proficiency. Although these data are estimates, the practitioner panel consulted about questionnaire design felt such estimates would be the best available means to elicit the wealth of programs' experience in the absence of useful "hard" data. Table 31 clearly demonstrates the differential effect of program goals and refugee backgrounds on the number of instructional hours required to achieve proficiency. For example, since the programs offer an average of 10.7 hours of instruction per week, then student "A" needs an estimated 93 weeks (1.8 years) to reach a language level which permits independent job

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 31

MEDIAN NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS REQUIRED FOR PROTOTYPIC REFUGEE ADULTS TO ACHIEVE THREE LEVELS OF ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
(n = 159)

	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY LEVEL		
	"Survival" (e.g., can take the bus, count money, get help in emergencies)	Can carry out simple conversations in English on several topics with acquaintances	Can look for a job on his/her own
(a) M. is a 50-year old woman from a preliterate group, who came to the U.S. in 1980, after spending three years in a refugee camp. She does not read or write in her own or any other language, and does not speak any but her native language. She was a farmer in her country, and American culture is totally new to her. She has a large family and, outside ESL class, has few contacts with English speakers.	280	500	1,000
(b) N. is a 35-year old man who lived in rural areas in his country where he was a blacksmith. He sometimes traded with other groups, and learned to speak another language within his native country. He has never been to school, but he learned to read a little of the national language, which does not have a Roman alphabet. In the refugee camps, his friends taught him to read and write a little bit in his own language.	150	380	600
(c) K. is a 24-year-old man who came here in 1980 from a medium-sized city. He was a radio operator in the military. He went to school for 4 years, where he learned to read and write in his own language. Before he came to the U.S., K. studied English for 12 weeks in a refugee camp, but he has never studied any other second language.	90	200	380
(d) S. is a 30-year-old man who came here in 1980. In his country, he had nine years of education. He ran a small business in the capital city there. Besides being able to read and write in his native language, S. speaks another trade language of his area. S. studied English for 12 weeks before coming here.	57	150	250

search. This compares to only 23 weeks for student "D". Since the programs require an average of 13 months to complete, most students should achieve the stated levels within this time period, except student "A" will not reach independent job search proficiency.

A number of local service providers reported that some refugees never achieve certain levels of language proficiency, regardless of the number of hours of English language training. Thirty percent of the local providers reported that the older, pre-literate refugee "A" would never achieve a level of English proficiency sufficient for independent job search. The ramifications of this are profound. About 11% of the U.S. refugee population falls in the age range of this prototypical refugee. While the degree of non-literacy for this group as a whole is not known, a very substantial proportion of older Southeast Asian refugees entering the U.S. are not literate.

These time estimates are the most stable measure of program performance available at the present time. Since both refugee characteristics and desired outcome levels are fixed, program differences in these items may be of considerable interest. An analysis was made of the effects of a wide-range of program characteristics on the estimated time for the prototypic refugees to achieve proficiency sufficient for "independent job search"--the level ultimately required to seek and gain employment. One statistically significant effect is the type of organization providing English language training. Community college programs estimate a significantly greater number of hours for refugee "B", "C" and "D" to reach an "independent job search" level of proficiency. Vocational-technical institutes estimate fewer hours for refugee "D". In addition, programs which emphasize employment and job services estimate a greater number of hours to reach this level. Use of bilingual personnel is also related to a higher number of instructional hours.

Estimates of the hours required to achieve the "conversational English" level are also related to type of organization, with community colleges estimating significantly more hours for all refugee prototypes than other types of organizations.

A few program characteristics are associated with the number of hours required to achieve basic "survival English". Both an emphasis on employment and the use of bilingual personnel seem to delay attainment of this basic proficiency level for students having limited literacy and educational backgrounds ("A" and "B"). Differentiation of instruction on the basis of students' academic/vocational level is associated with lower estimates of the hours required. Community colleges again predict more hours for all refugee prototypes, whereas vocational-technical schools predicted less hours to achieve "survival English" proficiency.

These findings strongly suggest that the goal and content of instruction must be differentiated on the basis of student background and desired language proficiency level. An emphasis upon employment too early in the instructional sequence appears to be counter-productive, as does the use of bilingual personnel. Furthermore, community colleges appear to be less efficient when the purpose of English language training is to move students from the conversational level of English to the independent job search level, whereas Vo-tech schools do a better job at this level. This finding seems reasonable since vocational schools are more employment-oriented and community college programs tend to be more oriented towards thorough mastery of skills.

When a program's reported instructional costs per student hour are multiplied by their estimates of instructional hours required, costs for various students to reach each proficiency level can be estimated. These estimated costs also vary dramatically, as shown in Table 32, in which median estimated costs (over programs) are displayed.

Table 32

MEDIAN COST PER STUDENT* TO ACHIEVE VARIOUS LEVELS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

	ENGLISH PROFICIENCY LEVEL		
	"Survival" (e.g., can take the bus, count money, get help in emergencies)	Can carry out simple conversations in English on several topics with acquaintances	Can look for a job on his/her own
(a) M. is a 50-year old woman from a preliterate group, who came to the U.S. in 1980, after spending three years in a refugee camp. She does not read or write in her own or any other language, and does not speak any but her native language. She was a farmer in her country, and American culture is totally new to her. She has a large family and, outside ESL class, has few contacts with English speakers.	$540	$1,095	$2,528
(b) M. is a 35-year old man who lived in rural areas in his country where he was a blacksmith. He sometimes traded with other groups, and learned to speak another language within his native country. He has never been to school, but he learned to read a little of the national language, which does not have a Roman alphabet. In the refugee camps, his friends taught him to read and write a little bit in his own language.	$360	$ 750	$1,314
(c) K. is a 24-year-old man who came here in 1980 from a medium-sized city. He was a radio operator in the military. He went to school for 4 years, where he learned to read and write in his own language. Before he came to the U.S., K. studied English for 12 weeks in a refugee camp, but he has never studied any other second language.	$140	$ 439	$ 805
(d) S. is a 30-year-old man who came here in 1980. In his country, he had nine years of education. He ran a small business in the capital city there. Besides being able to read and write in his native language, S. speaks another trade language of his area. S. studied English for 12 weeks before coming here.	$106	$ 320	$ 526

*Cost per student instructional hour x estimated number of instructional hours

Only one program characteristic is related to differences in these costs among programs. Estimated community colleges' costs are greater than those of other organizations for refugee "A" to reach "conversational" level and for refugee "C" to reach "survival" level.

Local service providers were asked to indicate reasons for student departures from their English language training program (LF2). The mean percentage of students leaving the program during or at the conclusion of the term was 30%. Table 33 summarizes the various reasons for their departures.

Table 33

REASONS FOR STUDENT DEPARTURES
(n = 174)

Reason	Mean Percent of Students Leaving
Employment	31%
Completed Program	25%
Moved Away	21%
Enrolled in Vocational Training	12%
Enrolled in Academic Program	8%

Of particular note in Table 32 is that the major reasons given for student departure are primarily desirable outcomes--employment, program completion and continuing education.

Although the analyses thus far have identifed program characteristics directly associated with program outcomes, it should also be noted that several important characteristics appear not to influence outcomes. For example, program size apparently does not make a difference. Furthermore, a program's clientele mix and range of services does not directly influence refugee program completion. The number of refugee services offered to refugees, the percentage of clientele who are refugees and the FY 82 enrollment of the programs do not significantly differentiate program outcome variables.

The fact that community colleges tend to predict a greater number of hours for refugees to achieve language proficiency may be due to a number of other related factors, such as experience with language training, academic orientation of program, length of term or desire to maintain student FTE. Additional data are needed to determine the specific factors underlying these results.

Correlations between various general program characteristics and outcomes were examined. Two characteristics emerged as being positively related to program outcomes. First, the percentage of full-time teachers is positively correlated with student completion rate. Second, the number of instructional hours per week is also positively related to student completion rate. One student characteristic is also strongly related to program outcomes. The percentage of students unemployed was correlated with the percentage of students completing the program--the greater the percentage unemployed, the greater the completion rate.

Thus, program completion rate is higher when instructional intensity is high, full-time teachers are used and students are not employed. Instructional intensity would seem to be a predictable outcome. Full-time teachers would more likely be certified, with educational training, thereby reflecting instructional quality. Student employment status probably relates to access, opportunity and a greater desire to complete the program.

3. What program characteristics are perceived to be related to program performance?

Respondents' opinions were sought concerning their perceptions of factors related to program quality and performance. Both state agencies (SG2/3) and local service providers (LJ1/2) were asked to suggest factors which promote and inhibit the success of refugee English language training programs.

State agencies and local service providers identified a number of factors related to the high quality of instruction:

Commonly Mentioned Factors

- Use of trained and certified teachers who are culturally sensitive, motivated and caring.

- Intensive ongoing program which emphasizes survival skills, employment and basic verbal skills.
- Differentiated instruction for literate/preliterate students.
- Highly coordinated services integrated with employment and case management.
- Motivation of student to attend.
- Flexible use of a variety of methods and materials.
- High intensity programs requiring student use of English.
- Available child care, transportation and bilingual aides.

Other Factors Mentioned

- Low student-teacher ratio.
- Well-defined scope of learning objectives.
- Involvement of sponsors and outside agencies.
- Use of refugees as role models and volunteers.
- Administrative support.
- Adequate, stable funding.

15. Orientation of the refugee to the need for English.

16. Good assessment and placement methods.

Not surprisingly, the most common factor mentioned by the two groups is the quality and sensitivity of the teacher. Teacher training, experience and attitude are considered to be the single most common factor which contributes to the success of refugee English language training. Therefore, those actions which can influence the quality and continuity of staff will benefit the programs.

4. What program improvement efforts have been implemented?

Renewal efforts enhance the quality and effectiveness of programs, their staff and instructional practices. A variety of renewal strategies are being used with ORR-funded English language training programs, including technical assistance, staff development and inter-program coordination.

Regional offices identified the specific kinds of technical assistance which had been sought from their agency (RA3). The eight regional respondents received a total of 214 requests for assistance in the past year, primarily for instructional materials, staff inservice training, curriculum design and bilingual assistance. The primary responses to the regional offices have been to refer such requests to the Center for Applied Linguistics (40% of the requests) and to provide assistance directly (21% of the requests).

Local service providers identified the areas in which they sought technical assistance and the sources from which it was received (LD8). About two-thirds (65%) of the 221 respondents requested technical assistance of one form or another. In all, 611 requests were made, of which 88% were met. Table 34 displays the types of technical assistance sought, while Table 35 summarizes the sources from which assistance was received. The tables also display the proportion of requests for assistance which were fulfilled.

Table 34

RANK ORDER OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDS
(n = 142)

Need Requested	Number of Requests	% of Requests	% Met
Instructional materials	159	26%	94%
Staff inservice training	122	20%	89%
Curriculum design	109	18%	87%
Student assessment	85	14%	80%
Bilingual assistance	58	9%	84%
Grant writing	52	9%	83%
Other	26	4%	92%

Table 35

RANK ORDER OF SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE SOUGHT BY LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS
(n = 142)

Sources Sought	Number of Requests	% of Requests	% Met
Center for Applied Linguistics	187	31%	87%
Other local service providers	146	24%	91%
State ORR agency	131	21%	-----
Other agencies	100	16%	87%
ORR regional office	47	8%	77%

The majority of the requests for assistance are related to instruction--about one-fourth (26%) of the requests were for help with instructional materials, one-fifth (20%) for staff development, nearly one-fifth (18%) for curriculum development and fourteen percent for student assessment.

Local programs' need for assistance is certainly expressed in these data. Fortunately, in the vast majority of cases, these needs were met (88%). The Center for Applied Linguistics was the agency sought in thirty-one percent of the requests, primarily in the areas of curriculum and instruction. Their "track record" was exceptional--87% of the requests for assistance were fulfilled, as reported by local service providers across the country.

Interestingly enough, other local service providers are the second most common source for technical assistance, being sought in nearly one-fourth (24%) of the requests, primarily in the areas of student assessment and instructional materials. Nearly all (91%) requests of other local providers were fulfilled. Help from the state coordinator's office was sought in more than one-fifth (21%) of the requests and fulfilled in nearly every (90%) instance. Assistance from the ORR regional office was sought in only 8% of the cases, but this agency might more appropriately provide assistance through other agencies.

State coordinators were also asked to describe requests they received for technical assistance from local service providers in the past year (SE4). The 30 respondents received an average of 11 requests. The areas in which assistance was sought and received are summarized in Table 36.

Table 36

REQUESTS RECEIVED BY STATE COORDINATORS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS
(n = 30)

Area of Need	Percent of States Receiving Requests
Staff inservice	47%
Instructional materials	44%
Curriculum design	42%
Student assessment	39%
Application preparation	22%
Bilingual assistance	19%
Other	11%

Like the local service providers, the state coordinators report that the most common needs for technical assistance are in the areas of staff development, curriculum and instruction, and student assessment. Requests received by the state coordinator were either handled directly by the state office or referred to CAL or other local service providers.

Exactly half of the states responding (50%) reported use of ORR funds to provide technical assistance. No state reported receiving any requests for assistance which went unfulfilled. A great deal of technical assistance is being requested and, more importantly, is being received. This suggests that local service providers recognize the need for program improvement and steps are being taken to increase the quality of English language training programs.

Staff inservice training is an area where technical assistance is commonly sought by local service providers. Indeed, 82% of the local service providers identified specific staff development needs for their programs (LD4). To meet these needs, 56% and 43% of the programs used ORR funds in FY 1981 and FY 1982 respectively, to support staff development. The reduction in this proportion is alarming, since it may reflect a reduction in the availability of inservice training for program improvement.

A vast array of staff development needs were voiced concerning curriculum and instruction. The most common needs identified by service providers, in order, were:

1. ESL theory and approaches
2. Student assessment
3. Curriculum materials
4. Cross-cultural awareness
5. Instructional methods for preliterates
6. Vocational, prevocational and survival skills materials
7. Specific instructional methods, including literacy training, pronunciation, individualization, motivation, centralization, oral/aural
8. Use of aides and volunteers

Local providers seek staff inservice training from a variety of sources (LD5). Table 37 lists the major sources of staff training used by the local programs. Self-training is the most common source of staff development. More than half of the programs seek assistance from state agencies, two-fifths from local colleges, universities and professional associations, and one-third from the Center for Applied Linguistics. Only 3% of the respondents indicated that no training is being provided at all.

Table 37

SOURCES OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT TRAINING
USED BY LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS
(n = 220)

Source of Staff Training	Percent of Programs Using Source
In-house staff	77.7%
State agencies	53.2%
Professional associations	41.8%
Center for Applied Linguistics	30.9%
Area colleges and universities	39.1%
Regional agencies	19.5%
Other source	12.7%

The pattern of staff development activities again suggests that essentially all local service providers are engaged in renewal efforts of one form or another. However, fewer programs are devoting ORR funds to these efforts.

Previous analyses identified program coordination and linkage as one of four major factors differentiating English language training programs. In open-ended questions, state and local providers also mentioned often the degree of coordination with community and employment services as a key factor in the success of refugee English language training.

Ninety-four percent (94%) of the state coordinators responding to the survey indicated that refugee consortiums or forums

operate in their states (SF1). The state level survey also inquired about the degree of coordination between English language training and other service agencies (SF2). Table 38 summarizes the degree of service coordination perceived by responding state coordinators and the percentage of states which require linkage as a matter of policy.

Table 38

DEGREE OF COORDINATION PERCEIVED AND REQUIRED BETWEEN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING AND OTHER SERVICES

Services	n	Percent of States Reporting "Close" or "Very Close" Coordination	Percent of States Requiring Linkage
Welfare/cash assistance	32	69%	44%
Health care	36	39%	6%
Job placement	34	85%	32%
Vocational training	34	65%	18%
Counseling/mental health	33	24%	3%

Agencies	n	Percent of States Reporting "Close" or "Very Close" Coordination	Percent of States Requiring Linkage
Private industrial councils	33	24%	--
CETA	35	34%	--
Job Corps	35	23%	--
MAAs	34	38%	3%
Local cultural centers	31	13%	--
Church groups	36	19%	--
Volags	35	71%	3%

In general, most states do not require linkages among services and agencies as a matter of policy. Welfare and job placement services are the two areas where linkage is mandated by about one-third of the state coordinators responding. In terms of perceived coordination among services, welfare, job placement and vocational training were most frequently reported to have close linkages with English language training.

Close ties between English language training and other specific agencies were less frequently reported. CETA and mutual assistance agencies (MAAs) have the most frequently reported linkages with refugee English language training.

At the local level, a parallel set of questions (LH1) inquired about the degree of coordination with other services and agencies. Table 39 summarizes the local service providers' reports of "close" or "very close" linkages with other services and agencies.

Table 39

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' PERCEPTIONS OF COORDINATION LINKAGES BETWEEN THEIR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM AND OTHER SERVICES AND AGENCIES

Services	n	Percent Describing Linkage as "Close" or "Very Close"
Welfare/cash assistance	214	50%
Health care	215	41%
Job placement	215	63%
Vocational training	216	54%
Counseling/mental health	208	38%

Agencies	n	Percent Describing Linkage as "Close" or "Very Close"
Private industrial councils	176	13%
CETA	209	70%
Job Corps	188	13%
MAAs	159	27%
Local cultural centers	180	23%
Church groups	209	48%
Volags	188	55%

At the local level, job placement, vocational training and welfare services are most frequently linked closely with local English language training programs. Local service providers report closer linkage with refugee-centered agencies--MAAs, local cultural centers, church groups and Volags--than the state coordinators report.

Although many local programs did report close linkages, it should also be noted that a substantial proportion of local service providers reported the opposite. For example, although 63% of the programs report close or very close linkages with job placement services, 37% did not. Similarly, half of the respondents did not report linkages with welfare or vocational training as being "close" or "very close."

The open-ended comments of state coordinators and local service providers offers additional evidence about the importance of service coordination in refugee English language training programs. More than 15% of the local service providers and 20% of the state coordinator offices specifically noted the availability, integration and coordination of support services and agency linkages as being a key factor to the success of these programs. Thus, the value of these linkages is recognized at the provider level as an avenue to program service improvement, but is far from being implemented across all programs.

IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the survey was to provide information about the extent, nature and effect of the English language training supported by the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement. Beyond the knowledge base which the survey results provide, the findings suggest avenues for program improvement. In this section, some conclusions are drawn and recommendations are offered for enhancing the quality of refugee English language training. Since the survey is only the first phase of the overall Study of Refugee English Language Training, many findings are not yet conclusive but await further evidence being collected in subsequent phases of this study.

Suggestions are grouped for four audiences: local service providers, state level administrative agencies, national policy-makers and organizations engaged in continuing research and evaluation efforts.

A. Local Providers of Refugee English Language Training

At least 327 local agencies provide refugee English language training using ORR funds in FY 82. These programs served an estimated 149,890 refugees in FY 82, down roughly ten thousand refugees from the previous year. About one-fourth of these programs have imposed waiting lists to limit entry of refugees into English language training. This suggests that programs are largely functioning at or near an optimum level, i.e., enrollment is expanding to fill available course offerings. For example, if no waiting lists existed, it could mean that too many programs were

available. Results indicate that waiting lists are about ten percent of the total adult refugee enrollment and that nearly one-third of the refugee students enroll in school within six months of arrival. This suggests that refugee adults are indeed gaining access to English language training.

For the most part, local service providers are experienced and were engaged in English language training prior to special refugee funding, but the majority (60%) of these programs now serve primarily refugee populations. In fact, 42% of the programs serve refugees exclusively. These results suggest that local service providers have made a commitment to serve a significant adult learner population in the nation.

The issues facing local service providers primarily concern the quality of English language training which can be provided for refugees. The survey data suggest a number of positive steps which might be taken by local service providers to enhance refugee English language training:

1. Emphasize the use of qualified, full-time teachers. In this case, qualified means not only certified with formal training in teaching English to non-native speakers, but also having experience with and sensitivity toward culturally-different peoples.

   The use of existing but unqualified full-time staff for teaching English to refugees must be avoided whenever possible. Similarly, reliance on experienced but part-time teachers should be minimized. There are clearly budget and personnel constraints on implementing these suggestions, and more resources and stability in the funding

environment are needed to facilitate this. In any case, staff qualifications must be the primary consideration in the implementation of English language training.

2. Design high-intensity instructional programs. Program completion rates are associated with the number of instructional hours offered per week. As with the use of full-time, qualified staff, it seems reasonable that the intensity of instruction should be positively related to learning.

3. Further differentiate levels of instruction. Programs have tended to offer more parallel sections of fewer courses rather than to differentiate course levels. Although this may increase accessibility to some degree, it decreases a program's responsiveness to differing refugee student needs. Differentiation of instruction is particularly important for tailoring classes to both literate and preliterate groups--a very common situation today. Furthermore, the relative emphasis given to survival English, employment-related English and literacy needs to be differentiated across course levels.

4. Promote goal-directed instruction. One difficulty which local service providers commonly encounter is that of defining purposes and expectations for their courses of instruction. Although it is easy to define an overall goal of English language proficiency which leads to employment and self-sufficiency, it is more useful to delineate specific learner outcomes for each course offering. In defining such outcomes, greater program continuity and purpose can be assured.

5. Focus on program outcomes and success. The survey findings indicate that local service providers tend to be more oriented to the process of English language training than to the assessment of student outcomes and program effectiveness. This is in part due to the limited state of the art in language proficiency assessment, but also reflects the absence of goal-directed instruction. If programs focus on success, it will be easier for them to document their effectiveness and justify their services.

6. Continue program renewal efforts. Staff development, technical assistance and inter-program coordination all represent methods being used for the ongoing improvement of program performance. These efforts not only enhance instructional practices, but also provide incentives for staff leadership and creativity.

7. Continue to develop and share guidelines and standards for English language training. A good deal of experimentation, development and innovation has occured at the local level. However, these developmental activities too often have taken place in isolation: curriculum materials, staff development activities and student assessment procedures are designed over and over again independently in individual classrooms and programs. Practices should be tested and shared through professional associations and other practitioner networks.

B. State Agencies Which Administer and Coordinate Refugee English Language Training.

Office of Refugee Resettlement social service funds are awarded to local service providers through purchase of service contracts with the 52 state refugee coordination offices. These state coordinators establish policies and guidelines for program funding and operations, monitor program compliance and performance, and provide technical assistance and coordination across local programs. Issues facing state coordinators concern the efficiency of English language training for refugees. The survey findings offer several suggestions for enhancing refugee programs at the state level:

1. Institute program monitoring procedures which focus on program outcomes and student progress. Although most state coordinators monitor local programs for fiscal, compliance and technical assistance matters, few direct their attention to the assessment of program impact. Without procedures for measuring program effectiveness, it is difficult to determine which programs and practices are most efficient.

2. Continue technical assistance activities which promote program improvement and coordination of services. Most state coordinators provide technical assistance of one form or another to local service providers. Continued leadership in individual problem-solving and group program development activities will help to enhance the efficiency of English language training program operations.

3. Establish priorities and objectives for refugee English language training. Purchase of service contracts could be tied to specific program objectives, with outcome measures for assessing program performance and impact. The characteristics, number and distribution of refugees to be served can be accounted for as part of the objective, thereby controlling for differential rates of language acquisition. Funding formulas could be based upon these objectives. Limited funds, combined with refugees which have a multiplicity of educational needs, provide further justification for establishing service priorities with clearly defined outcome expectations which can be directly measured.

4. Establish long-term relationships with local service providers to enhance program stability and continuity. If local service providers are going to establish and operate effective English language training for refugees, more program stability is necessary. Policies and procedures which encourage ongoing institutional relationships are needed to provide this continuity.

C. National Policy-makers Who Deal With Refugee Resettlement.

Roughly 43% of the ORR social service dollar in FY 82 was spent directly on refugee English language training. This finding is consistent with previous studies which have found that about 50% of all allocations to states support refugee programs which provide English language training and/or employment services exclusively.* ORR social service funds do

*Refugee Resettlement Program: A Report to Congress, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, January 31, 1982.

allow for a wide range of other services directed toward refugee resettlement and self-sufficiency. Therefore, an ongoing issue is the relative service mix of English language training, employment services and other allowable support services. The issue of service priority for advancing refugees' economic self-sufficiency is the ongoing concern of national policy-makers.

Survey results indicate that refugees are gaining access to English language training within a few months of arrival. Further, the majority of the refugees move successfully through and complete the English language training program. The survey was not designed to link the effects of training with employment services, employment and self-sufficiency. Therefore, the findings cannot determine the direct effects of English language training on refugee economic self-sufficiency. This question will be considered by subsequent research, including later phases of the current study. However, the survey findings can address a number of issues directly related to the quality of English language training opportunities for refugees.

1. The Office of Refugee Resettlement sponsors a substantial amount of English language training for refugees, which is further supplemented by funds from other sources. ORR-funded English language training programs served an estimated 149,890 refugees with $29,201,062 in funds. This represents a cost of only about $200 per refugee served. In addition, ORR-funded programs expended about $23,059,569 from non-ORR sources for refugee English language training. Furthermore, the survey did not include English language training programs which are not supported by ORR. Thus, a major portion of

refugee English language training funds come from other sources, such as adult basic education monies. This suggests that both the national enrollment and expenditure figures cited underestimate the total English language training provided to adult refugees.

Although both enrollment in and spending on refugee English language training declined somewhat from FY 81 to FY 82, refugee immigration to the United States declined slightly during this period, as well. Overall, English language training services have continued to be available to refugees as they arrive.

2. Federal resources should continue to support technical assistance services and information which benefit local service providers. Technical assistance is a common form of program improvement activity, along with staff development. The Center for Applied Linguistics has been the most common source of requests for technical assistance and successfully fulfilled 87% of these requests. These technical assistance activities enabled English language training programs to expand their curriculum materials, inservice training and student assessment strategies. As a national center, it performed more than the function of technical assistance. It also acted as a clearinghouse for both need-serving and innovative practices, thereby reducing duplication of effort and promoting the use of promising practices. Renewed support for such activities will directly benefit English language training of refugees.

3. The continuity of English language training program services should be encouraged at the federal level. Fluctuations in funding levels and cycles have made it difficult for local service providers to establish and operate stable and effective English language training programs. Ongoing institutional relationships between funding and provider agencies should be promoted to provide a more stable base for English language training services for refugees.

D. Organizations Engaged in Continuing Research and Evaluation Efforts

As part of ORR's ongoing effort to gain information about the effectiveness of services and the process of refugee adjustment, ORR has funded a number of studies over the past two years, in addition to the present one. The survey results suggest a need for continued research and development in refugee English language training:

1. Continue research and development efforts to articulate instructional objectives and their associated instructional materials and performance measures. Although numerous commercial materials are starting to appear, both curriculum and student assessment materials remain limited. This limitation is in part due to an absence of a defined scope and sequence of language skills which are appropriate for refugee English language training. Preliterate refugees pose a particular problem in this regard.

2. Further explore the specific relationship between general English language instruction and employment-related language instruction, as they influence refugee participation and progress in English language training programs. The two instructional goals appear to create interference depending upon the instructional level of the student. For example, survey results suggest that an emphasis upon employment too early in the instructional sequence may be counter-productive.

3. Further explore the manner in which the organizational characteristics of the local service provider influences English language training program cost, focus and performance. English language training programs offered by community colleges seem to differ from those provided by other organizations.

4. Determine the effect of instructional differentiation on refugee participation and performance. More information is needed regarding the relative effects of programs which have several locations and schedules of offerings to enhance refugee participation, as opposed to those programs which promote a greater diversification of instructional content to enhance refugee learning.

APPENDIX A

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0960-0273
Expires 9-30-82

Survey of English Language Training Programs for Refugees Provided Through the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement

Local Service Provider's Questionnaire

The U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement has contracted with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory to undertake a study of the extent, nature and quality of English language training being provided for refugees through the refugee resettlement program. As part of this study, all ORR Regional Offices, State Coordinators, and ORR-funded local service providers are being surveyed to learn more about the extent, costs, quality and effects of English language training. It is hoped that the collection and analysis of such information will help the ORR and ESL practitioners establish useful standards for training. In order to gather complete and accurate information, it is important that each local program complete the questionnaire.

Subsequent parts of this Project's work, will be particularly concerned with Southeast Asian refugee adults who have recently arrived with little prior exposure to English, Western Culture or formal classroom instruction. Information collected in this Project will help identify successful models and practices in English language training for this population.

The survey consists of ten sections which deal with the following major topics: (A) The Characteristics of Your Institution, (B) The Costs of Refugee English Language Training, (C) Characteristics of the Refugee Student, (D) Program Staff Characteristics, (E) Characteristics of the Instructional Program, (F) The Nature of Student Departures From the Program, (G) Assessment of Student Placement and Progress, (H) Linkage Among English Language Training and Other Refugee Services, (I) Developing Standards and Improving Programs, and (J) Successful Programs for Southeast Asian Refugees. Most questions are multiple choice to aid in your completion of the survey. In completing the survey, please confer with any individuals you deem necessary.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call Steve Reder, Steve Nelson, or Judy Arter toll free at 1-800-547-6339 or, in Oregon, call collect at 248-6800. Thank you for your time in assisting us with this Project.

For purposes of this survey, the term "refugee" will refer to those individuals included in the Refugee Act of 1980 as well as Haitian and Cuban entrants.

Name _____

Position _____

Program _____

Telephone No. _____

City _____

County _____

State _____

Information identifying you and your institution are being asked on this page so that we may conduct necessary follow-up activities. Our office will physically remove this page from the balance of the survey so that the confidentiality of your responses can be ensured. Your responses to this survey will not be released in such a way that would identify your particular program without your consent.

A. The Characteristics of Your Institution. In this section, information is sought about the location, function and nature of ORR-supported agencies and institutions which provide English language training services to refugees.

1. At what locations does your organization provide English language training for refugees? (✓)

- ☐ Primary location only
- ☐ Primary location and/or _____ additional sites (Number)

2. What is the nature of your organization? (✓)

- ☐ Community college
- ☐ Vocational-technical school
- ☐ Secondary-school adult education program
- ☐ Voluntary agency
- ☐ Mutual assistance association
- ☐ Other private nonprofit
- ☐ Private for profit
- ☐ Church
- ☐ Resettlement agency
- ☐ Other public agency (Specify)_____
- ☐ Other organization (Specify)_____

3. Considering your entire clientele and overall purpose, what primary services does your organization provide? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Academic preparation
- ☐ Cultural orientation
- ☐ Vocational training
- ☐ Language training
- ☐ Testing & placement services
- ☐ Spiritual or religious guidance
- ☐ Medical services
- ☐ Adult basic education
- ☐ Counseling
- ☐ Resettlement services
- ☐ Job placement services
- ☐ Other _____

4. What percentage of your clientele are refugees?

Current	Same Term Last Year
_____%	_____%

5. Did your institution provide English language training prior to the availability of funds designated for refugees? (✓)

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #6)

☐ Yes

(b) If yes, has your institution continued to serve this previous target population? (✓)

☐ Yes ☐ No

(c) If yes, how would you say that the initiation of the funding designated for refugee language training has affected the quality of your overall English language training program? (✓)

☐ Enhanced ☐ No Effect

☐ Detracted ☐ Don't Know

6. Indicate each service which your organization has provided for adult refugees during the current and preceding federal fiscal year. (Check all that apply)

	FFY 81	FFY 82
(a) Orientation	☐	☐
(b) ESL	☐	☐
(c) Health care provision or referral	☐	☐
(d) Transportation	☐	☐
(e) Interpretation/translation	☐	☐
(f) Child care	☐	☐
(g) Legal	☐	☐
(h) Prevocational training	☐	☐
(i) Vocational training	☐	☐
(j) Job placement	☐	☐
(k) Career counseling	☐	☐
(l) Mental health counseling	☐	☐
(m) Outreach/referral	☐	☐
(n) Home management	☐	☐
(o) Housing referral	☐	☐
(p) Social adjustment	☐	☐
(q) Intake and assessment	☐	☐
(r) Sponsor training	☐	☐
(s) Other _____	☐	☐
(t) Other _____	☐	☐

Considering the services which you have noted above, THE BALANCE OF THE SURVEY IS SOLELY CONCERNED WITH English language training for refugee adults. For the remainder of the survey, "English language training" means all those services and programs which emphasize the instruction of the English language. For example, such services could include English as a second language, vocational English as a second language, vocational and prevocational education, as well as those guidance and support services which are an integral part of such instruction. FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE SURVEY, PLEASE CONSIDER ALL ACTIVITIES WHICH MEET THE ABOVE DEFINITION AS YOUR ENTIRE "ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM."

B. The Costs of Refugee English Language Training. In this section, information is collected about the various sources of funds for English language training of refugee adults, as well as the nature of the costs of the programs.

1. What proportion of the total funds received for providing your English language training program is expended for: (a) direct instructional costs, (b) special support service to students, and (c) administrative or other institutional costs in the current and preceding fiscal years?

	Federal Fiscal Year 1981	Federal Fiscal Year 1982 (Estimate)
(a) Direct Instructional Costs (instructional staff, materials facilities & equipment)	_____%	_____%
(b) Special Support Service Costs (counseling, placement staff, transportation, etc.)	_____%	_____%
(c) Administrative Costs (administrative personnel, indirect costs, etc.)	_____%	_____%
TOTAL	100%	100%

2. What is your cost per student instructional hour of English language training for refugee students?

FFY 81 $_____ per hour

FFY 82 (Estimated) $_____ per hour

3. What is the total amount of funds received from the Office of Refugee Resettlement for your English language training program in the current and preceding federal fiscal year?

FFY 81: $_____

FFY 82: $_____
(Estimated for full year)

4a. Were other sources of funds used to supplement your ORR-supported English language training program for refugee adults during federal fiscal years 1981 or 1982? (✓)

☐ No (PROCEED TO SECTION C)

☐ Yes

(b) What other sources of funds were/are used in FFY 81 and FFY 82? (Check all that apply)

Source	FFY 81	FFY 82
Federal/CETA	☐	☐
Federal/Job Corps	☐	☐
Federal/Other (Specify) _____	☐	☐
State/ABE	☐	☐
State/other (Specify) _____	☐	☐
Private	☐	☐
Your organization's general funds	☐	☐
Local in-kind	☐	☐

(c) Approximately what proportion of funds supporting your English language training program for refugee adults is NOT from ORR in the current and preceding fiscal year?

FFY 81 Percent Non-ORR _____%

FFY 82 Percent Non-ORR (Estimated) _____%

C. Characteristics of the Refugee Student. This section is concerned with the refugee adult served by your English language training program as defined on page 4 of this questionnaire.

1. What is the total enrollment of refugee adult students in your English language training program during the preceding federal fiscal year and estimated for the current federal fiscal year? (Count a student more than once if enrolled for more than one term)

Total FFY 81 Enrollment _____

Total FFY 82 Estimated Enrollment _____

2. How many refugee students were in attendance in your English language training program the week of March 2, 1981 and the week of March 1, 1982?

Attendance the week of March 2, 1981 _____

Attendance the week of March 1, 1982 _____

3a. Is student eligibility for admissions to your refugee English language training program prioritized?

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #4)

☐ Yes

(b) Check each category having high priority and specify any criteria.

☐ New arrivals_____

☐ Employment status_____

☐ Head of household_____

☐ Household size_____

☐ Eligibility for public assistance_____.
_____

☐ Other (Specify)_____

☐ Other (Specify)_____

4. To what extent are each of the following characteristics used for differentiating the nature or level of English language instruction for individual refugee students enrolled in your program? (Check one column for each characteristic)

Student Characteristics	Not Considered	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Very Important
(a) Literacy				
(b) Age				
(c) Ethnicity				
(d) Sex				
(e) Employment status				
(f) Academic/vocational level				
(g) Present level of English				
(h) Other (Specify) _____				

5a. Is there currently a waiting list of refugees for entry into your English language training program?

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #6)

☐ Yes

(b) On the average, how long must students wait before being enrolled into the Program?

_____ weeks

(c) For the week of March 1, 1982, how many students were on the waiting list?

_____ students

6. Is your current English language training program designed for or particularly well suited to a specific segment of the refugee population? (✓)

☐ No, it's designed for the general adult refugee population

☐ Yes, it is especially directed toward the following kinds of refugee adults: (Specify)

_____

_____

7. What are the demographic characteristics of your refugee students during the current term and the same term in the preceding fiscal year? Please provide the results in the form of percentages, either estimated or actual.

	Characteristics	Percent of Students: Current Term	Percent of Students: Same Term Last Year	Cannot Estimate-Information Not Available
SEX:	Male	___%	___%	___
	Female	___%	___%	___
AGE:	24 or under	___%	___%	___
	25-34	___%	___%	___
	35-44	___%	___%	___
	45-54	___%	___%	___
	55 and above	___%	___%	___
ETHNICITY:	Vietnamese	___%	___%	___
	Chinese/Vietnamese	___%	___%	___
	Khmer (Cambodian)	___%	___%	___
	Lao	___%	___%	___
	Hmong	___%	___%	___
	Mien	___%	___%	___
	Haitian	___%	___%	___
	Cuban	___%	___%	___
	Soviet	___%	___%	___
	Other (Specify) _____	___%	___%	___

Continued ...

7. Continued

	Characteristics	Percent of Students: Current Term	Same Term Last Year	Cannot Estimate-Information Not Available
FORMAL EDUCATION IN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN:	None	____%	____%	____
	3 years or less	____%	____%	____
	4-6 years	____%	____%	____
	7-12 years	____%	____%	____
	13+ years	____%	____%	____
LITERACY:	Literate in some language	____%	____%	____
	Non-literate	____%	____%	____
LENGTH OF TIME IN U.S.:	0-6 months	____%	____%	____
	7-12 months	____%	____%	____
	13-18 months	____%	____%	____
	19-24 months	____%	____%	____
	25-30 months	____%	____%	____
	31-36 months	____%	____%	____
	More than 3 years	____%	____%	____
EMPLOY-MENT STATUS:	Employed full-time	____%	____%	____
	Employed part-time	____%	____%	____
	Not employed	____%	____%	____

8. Which of the following items are routinely included in your records of refugee students? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Age
- ☐ Sex
- ☐ U.S. arrival date
- ☐ Length of time in your program
- ☐ Employment status
- ☐ Native language
- ☐ Other languages spoken
- ☐ Previous schooling prior to U.S. arrival
- ☐ Literacy in native or other languages
- ☐ Public assistance status

D. Characteristics of the English Language Training Program Staff. In this section, a summary of the number, background and training needs of the English language training program personnel is sought.

1. List the number of staff positions in your current refugee English language training program, including both paid and volunteer positions:

Position	Number of Positions: Full-Time Paid	Part-Time Paid	Volunteer
(a) Administrative			
(b) Teachers			
(c) Instructional aides			
(d) Tutors			
(e) Clerical			
(f) Special services staff (e.g. counselors, job service, outreach, etc.)			
(g) Other: (Specify) _____ _____			

2. Does your current refugee English language training program utilize bilingual personnel as: (Check all that apply)

☐ teachers ☐ volunteers

☐ aides ☐ counselors

☐ other (Specify)_____

3. What kinds of training or educational requirements are required and preferred for an individual to work as a teacher in your refugee English language training program on a full- or part-time basis? (Check all that apply)

	Full-Time Teaching Position		Part-Time Teaching Position	
	Required	Preferred	Required	Preferred
(a) A.A. degree	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) B.A. degree	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) Teaching certificate	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) M.A. degree	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e) ESL certificate	☐	☐	☐	☐
(f) Other specialization or endorsement (Specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐
(g) Relevant experience 1 year	☐	☐	☐	☐
(h) Relevant experience 2-3 years	☐	☐	☐	☐
(i) Relevant experience 4+ years	☐	☐	☐	☐
(j) Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. What do you feel are the most critical staff development needs of your refugee English language training instructional personnel?

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

5. Who provides inservice training for your refugee English language training instructional personnel? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ In-house
- ☐ State agencies
- ☐ Professional association
- ☐ Commercial organizations
- ☐ Area college/ university
- ☐ Center for Applied Linguistics
- ☐ Other national technical assistance service _____
- ☐ Regional agencies
- ☐ Inservice training not offered
- ☐ Other _____

6. Were ORR funds used in *any* way to support inservice training in the current or preceding federal fiscal year? (✓)

	Yes	No
FFY 81	☐	☐
FFY 82	☐	☐

7. Has your program sought technical assistance from other sources?

☐ No (PROCEED TO SECTION E) ☐ Yes

8. What specific kinds of technical assistance were sought? From what sources was Technical Assistance requested and/or received? (Check all that apply) Req. = Requested; Got = Received.

Kinds of Technical Assistance	ORR Regional Office		State ORR Agency		Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)		Other Local Service Providers		Other (Specify)	
	Req.	Got	Req.	Got	Req.	Got	Req.	Got	Req.	Got
Student Assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Application or grant writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff inservice training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum design	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Instructional materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Bilingual assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (Specify): _____ _____ _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

E. Characteristics of the Instructional Program. In this section, the Office of Refugee Resettlement is particularly interested in the notable features of your refugee English language training program--its scope, intensity and organization.

1. What relative emphasis does your refugee English language training program give to each of the following goals? (Check one column for each alternative)

	No Emphasis	Little Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Heavy Emphasis
(a) Job services	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) Employment	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) Survival English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) Vocational English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e) Job-specific English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(f) Cultural orientation	☐	☐	☐	☐
(g) Bilingual orientation	☐	☐	☐	☐
(h) Reading/writing English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(i) Literacy training	☐	☐	☐	☐
(j) Other (Specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Inulcate course divisions, intensity, enrollment and staffing during the current term.

COURSES		INTENSITY (per section)		
Course Description (list each different course or course level)	No. of Parallel Sections for each Course or Level	Hours Per Day	Days Per Week	Weeks Per Term

COURSE ENROLLMENT (pool all sections)		COURSE COMPLETION (pool all sections)	TYPICAL STUDENT TEACHER RATIO (do not include aides)
Number of Refugees Enrolled	Non-Refugee Students Enrolled	Number of Refugee Students Completing Course or Course Levels	Number of Students per Teacher
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1
			:1

3. Of the refugee students who enroll in your program, what percent (estimate) eventually complete the entire refugee English language training program?

_____%

4. For those students who do complete the program, estimate the average number of calendar months spent in your program.

_____

5. In offering specific courses of instruction during each term, the student: (✓)

☐ may enroll and enter the class at any time during the term.

☐ may enroll and enter the class only at its onset.

☐ may enroll as space becomes available

F. The Nature of Student Departures from the Program. Students leave a program for a variety of reasons. In this section, the frequency and circumstances of refugee adult student departures are sought.

1. On the average, what percent of enrolled refugee students leave your English language training program during or at the end of each term?

_____%

2. What percentage of the students who leave during or at the end of the term do so for the following reasons:

_____% employment

_____% move away

_____% completed program

_____% enroll in vocational training

_____% continue in regular academic program

_____% other _____

_____% unknown

G. Assessment of Student Placement and Progress. In this section, the various methods and standards for assessing refugee student needs and progress are explored.

1. What formal or informal methods are used to place refugee students at the appropriate level of instruction in the English language training program? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Published, standardized examinations
- ☐ Locally developed tests
- ☐ Informal observation/interviews with student
- ☐ Other (Specify)_____
- ☐ No particular method used

2. What formal or informal methods are used to evaluate the progress of refugee students within the English language training program? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Formal, oral examinations
- ☐ Published, standardized examinations
- ☐ Locally developed tests
- ☐ Observation of classroom performance
- ☐ Mastery tests built into structured curriculum
- ☐ Informal interviews and observations
- ☐ Other (Specify)_____
- ☐ None

3. Few common standards or definitions exist across programs for identifying or measuring levels of English proficiency. Yet, it is essential that information can be gained about the rate at which refugee adult students acquire the English language. Despite this lack of consensus, many practitioners have considerable experience with recent refugees' acquisition of English. We wish to tap this base of experience.

To guide and structure the collection of this information, three levels of language proficiency have been behaviorally defined along with profiles of four refugee students. Based upon the experiences which you and your instructional staff have had with each type of student, please provide an estimate of the number of instructional hours required for each to achieve the three defined levels of proficiency:

Student	"Survival" (e.g. can take the bus, count money, get help in emergencies)	Can carry out simple conversations in English on several topics with acquaintances	Can look for a job on his/her own
(a) M. is a 50-year old woman from a preliterate group, who came to the U. S. in 1980, after spending three years in a refugee camp. She does not read or write in her own or any other language, and does not speak any but her native language. She was a farmer in her country, and American culture is totally new to her. She has a large family and, outside ESL class, has few contacts with English speakers.			

Student	"Survival" (e.g. can take the bus, count money, get help in emergencies)	Can carry out simple conversations in English on several topics with acquaintances	Can look for a job on his/her own
(b) W. is a 35-year old man who lived in rural areas in his country where he was a blacksmith. He sometimes traded with other groups, and learned to speak another language within his native country. He has never been to school, but he learned to read a little of the national language, which does not have a Roman alphabet. In the refugee camps, his friends taught him to read and write a little bit in his own language.			

Student	"Survival" (e.g. can take the bus, count money, get help in emergencies)	Can carry out simple conversations in English on several topics with acquaintances	Can look for a job on his/her own
(c) K. is a 24-year-old man who came here in 1980 from a medium-sized city. He was a radio operator in the military. He went to school for 4 years, where he learned to read and write in his own language. Before he came to the U. S., K. studied English for 12 weeks in a refugee camp, but he has never studied any other second language.			

Student	"Survival" (e.g. can take the bus, count money, get help in emergencies)	Can carry out simple conversations in English on several topics with acquaintances	Can look for a job on his/her own
(d) S. is a 30-year-old man who came here in 1980. In his country, he had nine years of education. He ran a small business in the capital city there. Besides being able to read and write in his native language, S. speaks another trade language of his area. S. studied English for 12 weeks before coming here.			

H. Linkage Among English Language Training and Other Refugee Services

1. How close at the local level are the links and coordination between your English language training and each of these other services provided for refugees? Please rate the degree of coordination between English language training and each of the other services/service providers below:

	Degree of Coordination				
	None	Little	Moderate	Close	Very Close
COORDINATION WITH OTHER SERVICES:					
Welfare/cash assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Health care	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job placement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vocational training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Counseling/mental health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (Specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES:					
PICs (private industrial councils)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
CETA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job Corps	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
MAAs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local "cultural centers"	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Church groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Volags	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (Specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

I. Developing Standards and Improving Programs. In this section, we seek information about the types of standards and guidelines your program now has and whether you feel they could be usefully and feasibly implemented.

1. Type of Written Standards or Guidelines	Currently Exist in Your Program? Yes	No	If No, Could Statewide Standards and Guidelines be Usefully and Feasibly Implemented? Yes	No
instructional materials/methods	☐	☐	☐	☐
staff training and qualifications	☐	☐	☐	☐
cost per student hour	☐	☐	☐	☐
program design (e.g. levels of instruction, student/teacher ratio, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐
assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐
program evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐
prioritizing student entry	☐	☐	☐	☐
other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐

J. Successful Programs for Southeast Asian Refugees. In subsequent phases of the study, we will be closely examining English language training programs which are particularly effective for Southeast Asian refugees. To help us plan this work, please answer the following questions.

1. In your opinion, what are the major factors which contribute to the success of English language training programs specifically designed for recently arrived Southeast Asian refugees with little previous education? (please list)

2. In your opinion, what are the major factors which inhibit the success of English language training programs for Southeast Asian refugees with little previous education? (please list)

3. Please name specific Southeast Asian refugee English language training programs which you feel are particularly successful and exemplary, including comments about their unique features. (please list)

APPENDIX B

STATE COORDINATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0960-0273
Expires 9-30-82

Survey of English Language Training Programs for Refugee Adults Provided Through the U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement

State Coordinator's Questionnaire

The U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement has contracted with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory to undertake a study of the extent, nature and quality of English language training being provided for refugees through the refugee resettlement program. As part of this study, all ORR Regional Offices, State Coordinators, and ORR-funded local service providers are being surveyed to learn more about the extent, costs, quality and effects of English language training. It is hoped that the collection and analysis of such information will help the ORR and ESL practitioners establish useful standards for training. In order to gather complete and accurate information, it is important that each State Coordinator complete the questionnaire.

Subsequent parts of this Project's work, will be particularly concerned with Southeast Asian refugee adults who have recently arrived with little prior exposure to English, Western Culture or formal classroom instruction. Information collected in this Project will help identify successful models and practices in English language training for this population.

The questionnaire consists of seven sections which deal with the following major topics: (A) Program Description, (B) State Policy--Student Participation, (C) State Policy--Applications & Allocations, (D) State Policy--Monitoring & Evaluation, (E) State Policy--Standards, (F) Linkage among English Language Training and Other Refugee Services, and (G) English Language Training for Southeast Asian Refugees. Most questions are multiple choice to aid in your completion of the survey. In completing the survey, please confer with any individuals deemed necessary.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call Steve Nadar, Steve Nelson, or Judy Arter toll free at 1-800-547-6339 or, in Oregon, call collect at 248-6800. Thank you for your time in assisting us with this Project.

For purposes of this survey, the term "refugee" will refer to those individuals included in the Refugee Act of 1980 as well as Haitian and Cuban entrants.

State _____

Name of Person Completing Questionnaire _____

Title _____

Telephone No. _____

Address _____

A. Program Description

1. Indicate the amount of money from each source spent statewide in English language training for refugee adults:

Source of Funds	Amount FFY 81	Amount FFY 82 (Est. for full year)	Unknown
(a) ORR	$_____	$_____	—
(b) ABE	$_____	$_____	—
(c) Other State (Specify) _____	$_____	$_____	—
(d) CETA	$_____	$_____	—
(e) Private foundations	$_____	$_____	—
(f) Voluntary agencies (VOLAGS)	$_____	$_____	—
(g) Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs)	$_____	$_____	—
(h) Other _____	$_____	$_____	—
SUBTOTAL	$_____	$_____	—
(i) Estimated value of donated and in-kind contributions from participating institutions in support of English language training:	$_____	$_____	—
TOTAL	$_____	$_____	—

2. Estimate the statewide number of volunteer hours donated to refugee English language training:

FFY 81 _____

FFY 82 _____

3. Estimate the number of refugee adults in the State receiving English language training:

	FFY 81	FFY 82 (Estimate for full year)
Southeast Asian	_____	_____
Cuban	_____	_____
Haitian	_____	_____
Soviet	_____	_____
Other_____	_____	_____

4. How many refugees were actively participating in English language training programs for the weeks below:

March 2, 1981 _____

March 1, 1982 _____

5. On the average, what is the present cost per instructional hour per refugee student for adult English language training in the State?

$_____

B. State Policy--Student Participation

1a. Is there a state policy which establishes the priority for admissions into an English language training program?

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2)

☐ Yes

(b) Check each category having high priority and specify any criteria.

☐ New arrivals_____

☐ Employment status_____

☐ Head of households_____

☐ Household size_____

☐ Eligibility for public assistance _____

☐ Other_____

☐ Other_____

☐ Other_____

2. Currently, are there limits imposed by State policy on the length of time refugee students may participate in English language training programs under each of the following conditions?

	Is there a limit?	If yes, what is the limit on length of participation?
(a) Daytime English language training while on welfare	Yes__ No__	_____
(b) Hours per week of English language training while on welfare	Yes__ No__	_____
(c) Total amount of English language training allowed	Yes__ No__	_____
(d) Other _____ _____	Yes__ No__	_____

3. After what length of residence in your State or in the U. S. is a refugee required to actually seek work in order to receive cash assistance?

☐ No requirement (PROCEED TO SECTION C)

☐ Yes. The requirement is _____

C. State Policy--Applications and Allocations

1. Does your State specify policies about how much ORR money is allocated statewide for English language training?

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2)

☐ Yes

(b) If yes, what percent of ORR social service funds is directed toward English language training?

_____%

2. What percentage of funds spent for English language training is directed toward specific types of English language training (e.g., vocational English language training, survival English, etc.)?

Type of English Language Training	Percent
_____	_____%
_____	_____%
_____	_____%
_____	_____%

3. What institutions may access ORR money for providing English language training? (Check all that apply)

☐ non-profit organizations

☐ sole-service providers

☐ public institutions

☐ profit organizations

☐ state agencies

☐ other _____

4. What type of service procurement procedures are utilized? (Check all that apply)

☐ request for proposals

☐ request for bids

☐ unsolicited proposals

☐ other_____

5. Are contractors permitted to subcontract for English language training?

☐ No ☐ Yes

6. Does your State policy set priorities for allocating money for English language training to geographical areas?

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #7)

☐ Yes

(b) What are they? (Check all that apply)

☐ unemployment rate

☐ general population density

☐ refugee concentration

☐ other (specify)_____

7. Do you have a funding formula for supporting English language training?

☐ No ☐ Yes, (specify)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Does your state specify priorities for the goals of English-language training programs for refugees?

☐ No (PROCEED TO NEXT SECTION)

☐ Yes

(b) What relative emphasis does your state policy give to each of the following goals? (Check one column for each alternative)

	No Emphasis	Little Emphasis	Moderate Emphasis	Heavy Emphasis
(a) Job services	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) Employment	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) Survival English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) Vocational English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e) Job-specific English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(f) Cultural orientation	☐	☐	☐	☐
(g) Bilingual orientation	☐	☐	☐	☐
(h) Reading/writing English	☐	☐	☐	☐
(i) Literacy training	☐	☐	☐	☐
(j) Other (Specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. State Policy--Monitoring and Evaluation

1a. Does your State monitor English language training programs for refugees?

☐ No (PROCEED TO QUESTION #2)

☐ Yes

(b) What types of monitoring or evaluation procedures do you use? (Check all that apply)

☐ audit

☐ cost/benefit

☐ compliance

☐ technical assistance

☐ impact

☐ other (specify)_____

(c) This is required of: (Check all that apply)

☐ all programs

☐ some programs

☐ other (specify)_____

2. Information Gathering. Information from English language training programs could be used to document program operations and effectiveness. The purpose of this section is to find out what information is currently collected.

Information	Is this information currently collected from service providers by the State? No	Yes
Program Description		
1. Goals	☐	☐
2. Student placement procedures	☐	☐
3. Materials used	☐	☐
4. Instructional methods	☐	☐
5. Procedures used for diagnosing student needs & monitoring student progress	☐	☐
6. Student:Instructor ratio	☐	☐
7. Coordination with vocational training activities & other employment related programs	☐	☐
8. Number of instructional hours per week	☐	☐
9. Course offerings	☐	☐
10. Setting	☐	☐
11. Levels of instruction	☐	☐
12. Technical assistance used	☐	☐
13. In-service training for staff	☐	☐
14. Other: (specify)_____	☐	☐

2. Continued

Information	Is this information currently collected from service providers by the State? No	Yes
Program Outcomes		
1. Design used for evaluating program outcomes	☐	☐
2. Tests or other instruments used for evaluating program outcomes	☐	☐
3. Program evaluation results	☐	☐
4. Tests used to evaluate student progress	☐	☐
5. Other: (specify)_____	☐	☐
Characteristics of Students Served		
1. Numbers	☐	☐
2. Ethnic/gender/age composition	☐	☐
3. Previous education	☐	☐
4. Previous literacy	☐	☐
5. English ability at program entry	☐	☐
6. Employment status	☐	☐
7. Public assistance status	☐	☐
8. Other: (specify)_____	☐	☐

2. Continued

Information	Is this information currently collected from service providers by the State? No	Yes
Funding/Costs		
1. From ORR	☐	☐
2. From other federal sources	☐	☐
3. From state sources	☐	☐
4. From private sources	☐	☐
5. Equivalent of in-kind services (volunteers, donated facilities, etc.)	☐	☐
6. Cost per student	☐	☐
7. Cost per instructional hour	☐	☐
8. Other: (specify)_____	☐	☐

E. Developing Standards and Improving Programs. One of the major goals of the study is to identify factors which contribute to or detract from the success of English language training programs for refugees. In this section, we seek information about the types of standards and guidelines your program now has, and whether you perceive a need for new or improved standards or guidelines in various areas.

1. Type of Written Standards or Guidelines	Currently exist in your State? Yes	No	Could a guideline or standard be feasibly implemented by the State? Yes	No	See need for new or improved standards or guidelines? Yes	No
instructional materials/methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
staff training and qualifications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
cost per student hour	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
program design (e.g. levels of instruction, student/teacher ratio, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
student assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
program evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
prioritizing student entry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
other _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. In order to receive ORR funding, with what specific contractual conditions must the service providers comply?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Approximately how many requests did your State office receive for technical assistance to English language training local service providers during the past 12 months?

_____

4. What specific kinds of technical assistance were sought? What action did your agency take in response to these requests? (Check all that apply)

	Actions Taken					
Kinds of Technical Assistance	Technical Assistance Provided Directly by Regional Office	Referred to CAL (Center for Applied Linguistics)	Referred to ORR State Office	Referred to Other Local Service Providers in Region	Unable to Provide Assistance or Referral	Other Referral (Specify)
Student Assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Application or grant writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Staff inservice training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Curriculum design	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Instructional materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Bilingual assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Other (Specify) _____ _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____

5. Did your State use ORR funds for providing technical assistance to local programs?

☐ No ☐ Yes

F. Linkage Among English Language Training and Other Refugee Services

1. Describe any existing refugee forums or service consortiums in your State.

_____

_____

_____

2. How close at the State level are the links and coordination between English language training and each of these other services provided for refugees? Please rate the degree of coordination between English language training and each of the other services/service providers below:

	Degree of Coordination: None	Little	Moderate	Close	Very Close	☑ If Policy Requires Linkage
COORDINATION WITH OTHER SERVICES:						
Welfare/cash assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Health care	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job placement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vocational training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Counseling/mental health	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (Specify)_____ _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES:						
PICs (private industrial councils)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
CETA	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job Corps	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
MAAs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Local "cultural centers"	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Church groups	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Volags	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

G. Successful Programs for Southeast Asian Refugees. In subsequent phases of the study, we will be closely examining English language training programs which are particularly effective for Southeast Asian refugees. To help us plan this work, please answer the following questions.

1a. Can you recommend any competency-based English language tests for Southeast Asian refugees with little educational background used in your State?

__ No

__ Yes, specify

(b) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. In your opinion, what are the major factors which contribute to the success of English language training programs for Southeast Asian refugees with little educational background? (please list)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. In your opinion, what are the major factors which inhibit the success of English language training programs for Southeast Asian refugee with little educational background? (please list)

4. Please name specific Southeast Asian refugee English language training programs which you feel are particularly successful and exemplary, including comments about their unique features. (please list)

APPENDIX C

ORR REGIONAL OFFICE QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey of English Language Training Programs
for Refugee Adults
Provided Through the Office of Refugee Resettlement

ORR Regional Office
Questionnaire

The U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement has contracted with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory to undertake a study of the extent, nature and quality of English language training being provided for refugees through the refugee resettlement program. As part of this study, all ORR Regional Offices, State Coordinators, and ORR-funded local service providers are being surveyed to learn more about the extent, costs, quality and effects of English language training. It is hoped that the collection and analysis of such information will help the ORR and ESL practitioners establish useful standards for training. In order to gather complete and accurate information, it is important that each Regional Office complete the questionnaire.

Subsequent parts of this Project's work will be particularly concerned with Southeast Asian refugee adults who have recently arrived with little prior exposure to English, Western Culture or formal classroom instruction. Information collected in this Project will help identify successful models and practices in English language training for this population.

The questionnaire consists of five sections which deal with the following major topics: (A) Program Operations, (B) The Role of the ORR Regional Offices, (C) Developing Standards and Improving Programs, (D) Recommended Monitoring System, and (E) Successful Programs for Southeast Asian Refugees. Most questions are multiple choice to aid in your completion of the survey. In completing the survey, please confer with any individuals deemed necessary.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call Steve Reder, Steve Nelson, or Judy Artar toll free at 1-800-547-6339 or, in Oregon, call collect at 248-6800. Thank you for your time in assisting us with this Project.

For purposes of this survey, the term "refugee" will refer to those individuals included in the Refugee Act of 1980 as well as Haitian and Cuban entrants.

Region _____

Name of Person Completing Survey _____

Title _____

Telephone No. _____

Address _____

A. Program Operations.

1. How many English language training programs serving refugees are operating within your region and how many refugees did they serve last year?

	Federally Supported	Without Federal Support
Total Number of Local Programs (FFY 81)		
Total Number of Refugees Served (FFY 81)		

2. Approximately how many requests did your Regional Office receive for technical assistance to English language training programs during the past 12 months? (state or local)

_____

3. What specific kinds of technical assistance were sought? What action did your agency take in response to these requests? (Check all that apply)

	Actions Taken					
Kinds of Technical Assistance	Technical Assistance Provided Directly by Regional Office	Referred to CAL (Center for Applied Linguistics)	Referred to ORR State Office	Referred to Other Local Service Providers in Region	Unable to Provide Assistance or Referral	Other Referral (Specify)
Student Assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Application or grant writing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Staff inservice training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Curriculum design	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Instructional materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Bilingual assistance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____
Other (Specify) _____ _____ _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ _____

B. The Role of the ORR Regional Offices. This section is designed to characterize the present role of ORR Regional Offices and to gather your perceptions about how the ORR Regional Offices could best be integrated into a total English language training network.

1. Please describe the roles which the Regional Office fill in relation to ORR-related state agencies.

2. Please describe the roles which the Regional office fill in relation to local providers of English language training services for refugees.

3. Please describe any special efforts of the Regional Office concerning English language training for adult refugees.

4. What do you see are the major impediments (if any) to assuming the roles described in the preceeding three questions?

5. Are any of these roles facilitated and/or encouraged by states or the federal government? How?

6. Use the space below for any comments or suggestions you have concerning the role of the ORR Regional Office in the provision network for English language training for refugees.

C. Developing Standards and Improving Programs. One of the major goals of the study is to identify factors which contribute to or detract from the success of English language training programs for refugees. In this section, we seek information about the types of standards and guidelines which exist within your region, and whether you perceive a need for new or improved standards or guidelines in various areas.

1. Type of Written Standards or Guidelines	Currently exist in your States? (✓) Fill in the name of each State in your region in the space provided.								Could a guideline or standard be feasibly implemented?		See need for new or improved standards or guidelines?	
									Yes	No	Yes	No
instructional materials/ methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
staff training and qualifications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
cost per student hour	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
program design (e.g., levels of instruction, student/teacher ratio, etc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
student assessment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
program evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
prioritizing student entry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
other_____ _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

D. Information Gathering. Information from English Language training programs could be used to document program operations and effectiveness. The purpose of this section is to find out what information is currently collected and to elicit your recommendations as to what information could be usefully and feasibly collected from programs and states.

Information	Is this information currently available at the Regional level? No	Yes, but only for some States	Yes	Does the Regional Office currently gather this information from the States? No	Yes	Could the Regional Office usefully and feasibly collect this information from the States? No	Yes
Program Description							
1. Goals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Student placement procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Materials used	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Instructional methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Procedures used for diagnosing student needs & monitoring student progress	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Continued ...

Information	Is this information currently available at the Regional level? No	Yes, but only for some States	Yes	Does the Regional Office currently gather this information from the States? No	Yes	Could the Regional Office usefully and feasibly collect this information from the States? No	Yes
6. Student:Instructor ratio	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Coordination with vocational training activities and other employment related programs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Number of instructional hours per week	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Course offerings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Setting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Levels of instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Technical assistance used	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. In-service training for staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Other:_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Program Outcomes							
1. Design used for evaluating program outcomes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Tests or other instruments used for evaluating program outcomes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Program evaluation results	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Tests used to evaluate student progress	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Other (specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Continued ...

Information	Is this information currently available at the Regional level? No	Yes, but only for some States	Yes	Does the Regional Office currently gather this information from the States? No	Yes	Could the Regional Office usefully and feasibly collect this information from the States? No	Yes
Characteristics of Students Served							
1. Numbers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Ethnic/gender/age composition	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Previous education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Previous literacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. English ability at program entry	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Employment status	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Public assistance status	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Other (specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Funding/Costs							
1. From ORR	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. From other federal sources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. From state sources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. From private sources	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Equivalent of in-kind services (volunteers, donated facilities, etc.)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Cost per student	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Cost per instructional hour	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Other (specify)_____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. What do you see as an Efficient Flow of Information?

a. Who reports?

- ☐ All States
- ☐ Representative sample of service providers in the region
- ☐ All service providers in the region
- ☐ Other _____

b. How often could information be feasibly collected?

- ☐ Quarterly
- ☐ Semi-annually
- ☐ Annually
- ☐ Other _____

3. Use the space below if you have other comments/concerns about a data collection system.

E. Successful Programs for Southeast Asian Refugees. In subsequent phases of the study, we will be closely examining English language training programs which are particularly effective for Southeast Asian refugees. To help us plan this work, please answer the following questions.

1. In your opinion, what are the major factors which contribute to the success of English language training programs for Southeast Asian refugees with little educational background? (please list)

2. In your opinion, what are the major factors which inhibit the success of English language training programs for Southeast Asian refugee with little educational background? (please list)

3. Please name specific Southeast Asian refugee English language training programs which you feel are particularly successful and exemplary, including comments about their unique features. (please list)

APPENDIX D

NORMATIVE TABLES OF KEY ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

1 Normative distribution of the number of locations at which organizations provide refugee English language training (LA1)

2 Normative distribution of the percentage of local service providers' clientele who are refugees in FY 82 (LA4)

3 Normative distribution of the cost per refugee student instructional hour in FY 82 (LB2)

4 Normative distribution of the number of full-time teachers employed in English language training programs (LD1)

5 Normative distribution of the number of part-time teachers employed in English language training programs (LD1)

6 Normative distribution of the number of course levels offered concurrently by local service providers (LE2)

7 Normative distribution of the average number of hours per day a class is offered by local service providers (LE2)

8 Normative distribution of the average weeks per term classes are offered by local service providers (LE2)

9 Normative distribution of the number of students per teacher in English language training classes (LE2)

10 Normative distribution of the percentage of English language training paid teachers who are full-time (LD1)

11 Normative distribution of the percentage of English language training program funds directly devoted to instructional costs (LB1)

Table 1

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF LOCATIONS AT WHICH ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

(n = 226)

Locations	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
1	44	44
2	20	64
3	10	74
4	8	81
5	6	87
6	4	92
7	2	93
8	1	95
9	1	96
10	1	96
11	4	100

Table 2

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PERCENTAGE OF LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' CLIENTELE WHO ARE REFUGEES IN FY 82

(n = 159)

Percent of Clientele Refugee	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent of Programs
1-9	20	20
10-19	6	26
20-29	3	29
30-39	5	34
40-49	3	37
50-59	2	39
60-69	3	42
70-79	2	44
80-89	5	49
90-100	51	100

Table 3

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE COST PER
REFUGEE STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL HOUR IN FY 82

(n = 150)

Cost Per Student Instructional	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
Less than $1.00	10	10
$1.00 to $1.99	27	37
$2.00 to $2.99	22	59
$3.00 to $3.99	9	68
$4.00 to $4.99	7	75
$5.00 to $5.99	2	77
$6.00 to $6.99	1	78
$7.00 to $7.99	2	79
$8.00 or more	21	100

Table 4

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF FULL-TIME TEACHERS EMPLOYED IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

(n = 215)

Number of Full-Time Teachers	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
None	57	57
1-4	32	89
5-9	8	97
10-14	1	98
15-19	1	99
20 or more	1	100

Table 5

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF PART-TIME TEACHERS EMPLOYED IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

(n = 210)

Number of Part-Time Teachers	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
None	27	27
1-4	42	69
5-9	21	90
10-14	6	96
15-19	1	97
20 or more	3	100

Table 6

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF COURSE LEVELS OFFERED CONCURRENTLY BY LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

(n = 195)

Number of Course Levels	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
1	14	14
2	12	26
3	21	47
4	14	61
5	11	72
6	8	80
7	5	85
8	5	90
9	5	95
10	1	96
11 or more	4	100

Table 7

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS PER DAY A CLASS IS OFFERED BY LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

(n = 192)

Hours Per Day	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
1	4	7
2	28	32
3	44	76
4	44	88
5	7	95
6	4	99
7	1	100

Table 8

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF WEEKS PER TERM CLASSES ARE OFFERED BY TOTAL SERVICE PROVIDERS

(n = 179)

Weeks Per Term	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
1-9	8	8
10-19	53	61
20-29	12	73
30-39	6	79
40-49	6	85
50 or more	15	100

Table 9

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER TEACHER IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING CLASSES

(n = 182)

Number of Students Per Teacher	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
1-4	7	7
5-9	12	19
10-14	23	42
15-19	23	65
20-24	18	83
25-29	10	93
30-34	3	96
35-39	1	97
40 or more	3	100

Table 10

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PERCENTAGE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PAID TEACHERS WHO ARE FULL-TIME

(n = 206)

Percent of Teachers Full-Time	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
0	55	55
1-9	4	59
10-19	3	62
20-29	5	67
30-39	2	69
40-49	3	72
50-59	5	77
60-69	1	78
70-79	2	80
80-89	1	81
90-100	19	100

Table 11

NORMATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PERCENTAGE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM FUNDS DIRECTLY DEVOTED TO INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS

(n = 177)

Percentage of Funds for Instruction	Percent of Programs	Cumulative Percent
1-9	1	1
10-19	1	2
20-29	1	3
30-39	7	10
40-49	8	18
50-59	10	28
60-69	11	39
70-79	16	55
80-89	18	73
90-100	27	100

APPENDIX E

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A. Specific Procedures

The survey development procedure consisted of five major steps:

Step One--Develop Plan for Collecting Comprehensive Descriptive Data

Early in the study, meetings were held with ORR officials to review the preliminary study design, discuss issues related to the work and outline study questions. During a subsequent series of project staff meetings, some of which included a team of consultants having expertise in the administration of English language training programs for refugees, the overall plan for the survey was developed. Suggestions provided by numerous state and regional offices were drawn upon in developing the study.

Step Two--Compile List of English Language Training Service Providers

One major unanticipated problem was obtaining a comprehensive list of local service providers. In the original work plan, the Office of Refugee Resettlement was to provide a list of what they estimated to be 250 local service providers. Such a comprehensive list of ORR-funded English language training programs had never been established before at the national level. The list was to include English language training providers who had been supported by ORR in either FY 1981 or FY 1982. Although the approximate number of ORR contracts for services was known at the state level, the total number of agencies which directly provide ORR-supported service to refugee adults could not be readily ascertained. In many states, large contractors (e.g., state agencies) were not the direct service providers, since they

subcontracted to, or otherwise funded, other agencies to provide direct services.

Through a series of additions, deletions and revisions to the original list, a mailing list was developed. Although questionnaires were mailed to 389 agencies, only 327 proved to be bona fide ORR-funded providers of English language training for the purposes of the survey.

Step Three--Develop Survey Instruments

The three (local, state and regional) survey instruments were developed and field tested with a small sample of each target population. The questionnaire design work involved four stages. First, study questions and issues were solicited from the Office of Refugee Resettlement. Second, a team of consultants representing both state and local programs was organized to help staff generate items for each study question and to suggest appropriate response formats for each item. Third, these items were reviewed, refined and compiled into draft versions of the survey instruments. Fourth, the draft instruments were reviewed and field tested at the local, state and regional level, as well as by the Office of Refugee Resettlement. Final revisions were made to the questionnaires on the basis of the field test and the material was submitted for mandatory clearance by the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

Step Four--Conduct the Survey

The distribution of surveys to the local, state and regional offices occurred in four steps: (1) Upon receipt of OMB clearance, a letter was distributed to each regional office, state and local service provider advising

them of the impending arrival of the survey questionnaire (mailed March 16, 1982). (2) The questionnaires were mailed to each respondent with a cover letter and prepaid return envelopes (March 18, 1982). (3) Three weeks later (April 13, 1982), a follow-up letter was distributed to all recipients thanking them for their cooperation and asking those who had not yet responded to return the completed questionnaire. A second copy of the questionnaire and a prepaid, return envelope was enclosed in case the first had not arrived or had been misplaced. (4) Finally, follow-up telephone calls were made on April 22-23, 1982 to those recipients who had failed to reply to determine if assistance was needed in completing the survey and to encourage their response. Questionnaires completed and returned by May 20, 1982 have been included in results presented in this report.

Step Five--Analyze and Interpret the Findings

The analysis of the findings occurred in six steps. First, computer programs for the analysis and tabulation of the data were developed and debugged. Second, survey responses were coded, keypunched, verified and entered into the computer system. Third, preliminary analysis of the data was conducted to generate initial answers to each study question. Fourth, additional analyses were conducted as warranted. Finally, written descriptions of the overall results of the survey were prepared.

The analysis of the survey responses was organized with respect to each of the study questions. The results are described using measures of central tendency, variation, and inter-item association. In some cases, comparisons and contrasts among respondent groups are appropriate, particularly for identifying discrepant perceptions within the service delivery system.

B. Instrumentation

The three questionnaires are presented in Appendices A-C. The questionnaires consist of a combination of open-ended and structured items across a series of topic areas. Wherever possible, multiple-choice items were utilized for ease of both completion and tabulation.

The ORR Regional Office questionnaire consists of five sections which deal with the following major topics: (1) program operation, (2) the role of the ORR regional office, (3) developing standards and improving programs, (4) recommended monitoring system, and (5) successful programs for Southeast Asian refugees. The survey questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

The State Coordinator's questionnaire consists of seven sections which deal with the following major topics: (1) program description, (2) state policy--student participation, (3) state policy--applications and allocations (4) state policy--monitoring and evaluation, (5) state policy--standards, (6) linkage among English language training and other refugee services, and (7) successful programs for English language training of Southeast Asian refugees. The survey questionnaire is provided in Appendix B.

The Local Service Provider's questionnaire was by far the most extensive, covering ten topic areas: (1) characteristics of the institution, (2) costs of refugee English language training, (3) characteristics of the refugee student, (4) program staff characteristics, (5) characteristics of the instructional program, (6) the nature of student departure from the program, (7) assessment of student placement and progress, (8) linkage among English language training and other refugee services, (9) developing standards and improving programs, and (10) successful programs for Southeast Asian refugees. The survey questionnaire is provided in Appendix C.

APPENDIX F

TABLES COMPARING RESULTS FOR THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST REFUGEE POPULATIONS TO RESULTS FOR ALL PROGRAMS

F-1 Local Service Providers' Criteria for Refugees' Admission into English Language Training

F-2 Local Service Providers' Training and Experience Requirements for Full-time Teachers

F-3 Local Service Providers' Training and Experience Requirements for Part-Time Teachers

F-4 Median Percentage and Amount of Funds Received from ORR by Refugee English Language Training Programs

F-5 Median Cost Per Student Instructional Hour for Refugee English Language Training, by Year

F-6 Sex of Adult Refugee Students by Year for the 15 States with the Largest Refugee Population and the Nation as a Whole

F-7 Age Distribution of Adult Refugee Students for Programs in the 15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations and for the Nation As a Whole

F-8 Distribution of Adult Refugee Students' Formal Education in Country of Origin for the 15 States with the Largest Populations and for the Nation Ar a Whole

F-9 Distribution of Adult Refugee Students' Formal Education in Country of Origin, by Year

F-10 Literacy of Adult Refugee Students in FY 81 and FY 82 for Programs in the 15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations and the Nation As a Whole

F-11 Adult Refugee Students' Length of Residence in the United States for Programs in the 15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations and All Programs in the Nation, by Year

F-12 Employment Status of Adult Refugee Students, By Year

Table F-1

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' CRITERIA FOR REFUGEES' ADMISSION
INTO ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING
(n = 110)

Criterion	Percent of Programs*	Programs in 15 States With Largest Refugee Populations
No Priority	44.4	22.7
New arrivals	32.7	42.5
Head of household	28.7	40.1
Employment status	26.5	33.7
Eligibility for public assistance	25.1	34.3

*Percentages do not add to 100 since programs may use several admissions priorities.

Table F-2

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR FULL-TIME TEACHERS

Requirement Area	Percentage of all Local Service Providers (n = 232)	Percentage of Local Service Providers in 15 States with Largest Refugee Population (n = 130)
A.A. degree	0.0	1.5
B.A. degree	38.8	41.5
Teaching certificate	22.8	20.8
M.A. degree	7.3	8.5
ESL certificate	3.4	4.6
Other specialization or endorsement	4.3	4.6
One-year relevant experience	11.2	13.8
Two-three years relevant experience	9.5	13.1
Four or more years relevant experience	1.3	1.5

Table F-3

LOCAL SERVICE PROVIDERS' TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR PART-TIME TEACHERS

Requirement Area	Percentage of all Local Service Providers (n = 232)	Percentage of Local Service Providers in 15 States with Largest Refugee Population (n = 130)
A.A. degree	3.4	3.8
B.A. degree	47.0	57.7
Teaching certificate	24.6	25.4
M.A. degree	1.3	1.5
ESL certificate	4.3	4.6
Other specialization or endorsement	4.3	4.6
One-year relevant experience	19.4	24.6
Two-three years relevant experience	7.8	1.3
Four or more years relevant experience	1.3	2.3

Table F-4

MEDIAN PERCENTAGE AND AMOUNT OF FUNDS RECEIVED FROM ORR BY REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

	All Programs (n = 192)	Programs in 15 States with Largest Refugee Population (n=107)
Median percent of refugee English language training program funds from ORR	70%	67%
Median amount of ORR funds per program	$45,621	$60,000

Table F-5

MEDIAN COST PER STUDENT INSTRUCTIONAL HOUR FOR REFUGEE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING, BY YEAR (n = 144)

	FY 1981	FY 1982
All programs	$2.00	$2.31

Table F-6

SEX OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS BY YEAR FOR THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST REFUGEE POPULATION (n = 96) AND THE NATION AS A WHOLE (n = 169)

	FY 81		FY 82	
	Percent Male	Percent Female	Percent Male	Percent Female
15 States with Largest Refugee Populations	58	42	59	41
All States	58	42	58	42

Table F-7

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS FOR PROGRAMS IN THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST REFUGEE POPULATIONS (n = 76) AND FOR THE NATION AS A WHOLE (n = 104)

Age	24	25-34	35-44	45+
FY 81				
15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations	26	39	23	12
All States	27	38	24	11
FY 82				
15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations	32	39	18	11
All States	31	39	19	11

Table F-8

DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS' FORMAL EDUCATION IN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN FOR THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST POPULATIONS (n = 71) AND FOR THE NATION AS A WHOLE (n = 124)

Year/Ethnicity	Vietnamese	Chinese/Vietnamese	Khmer (Cambodian)	Lao	Hmong	Mien	Haitian	Cuban	Soviet	Other
FY 81 Impacted States	32.1	12.1	11.2	19.1	19.8	2.6	*	0.3	0.3	2.3
All States	32.9	11.4	11.3	19.8	18.8	2.4	*	0.6	0.5	2.3
FY 82 Impacted States	36.3	15.6	14.6	17.4	11.4	1.0	0.1	0.6	0.3	2.5
All States	36.4	13.2	15.6	18.8	10.5	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.4	3.4

*Less than 0.1 perc

Table F-9

DISTRIBUTION OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS' FORMAL EDUCATION IN COUNTRY OF ORIGIN, BY YEAR
(n = 124)

		Percentage of Students Having Different Number of Years of Formal Education				
		None	1-3	4-6	7-12	13+
FY 81	15 States	23.7	19.5	27.2	25.8	3.8
	All States	22.3	19.0	28.2	26.0	4.5
FY 82	15 States	16.2	21.1	28.2	31.2	3.2
	All States	15.2	19.6	29.5	31.5	4.2

Table F-10

LITERACY OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS IN FY 81 AND FY 82 FOR PROGRAMS IN THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST REFUGEE POPULATIONS (n = 92) AND FOR THE NATION AS A WHOLE (n = 159)

Percent Literate in Some Language	FY 81	FY 82
15 States with the Largest Refugee Populations	76.3	80.4
All States	75.5	81.2

Table F-11

ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS' LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES FOR PROGRAMS IN THE 15 STATES WITH THE LARGEST REFUGEE POPULATIONS (n = 70) AND FOR ALL PROGRAMS IN THE NATION, BY YEAR (n = 125)

		Percentage of Students Residing in the U.S. for Various Numbers of Months						
		0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	36+
FY 81	15 States	30.7	21.1	18.4	12.7	4.9	2.9	2.3
	All States	32.7	28.2	17.9	11.4	4.7	2.7	2.3
FY 82	15 States	27.8	24.9	15.0	20.8	6.2	2.9	2.4
	All States	30.5	27.1	15.1	16.6	5.3	2.7	2.6

Table F-12

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ADULT REFUGEE STUDENTS, BY YEAR (n = 125)

		Employed		Unemployed
Year/Employment Status		Full Time	Part-Time	
FY 81	15 States	9.5	7.3	83.2
	All States	11.5	9.8	78.7
FY 82	15 States	11.8	13.5	74.7
	All States	15.5	14.4	70.0